

FEB -8 1960

B

817449

Per

THE LIBRARY OF  
CONGRESS  
SERIALS ACQUISITION

FEB 11 1959

Copy

# THE SHAW // REVIEW

VOL. III, No. 1

JANUARY, 1960

PUBLISHED BY THE SHAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.  
AND THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PR5366  
. A15.

## THE SHAW REVIEW

(Continuing *The Shaw Bulletin*)

Stanley Weintraub

*Editor*

Charles A. Carpenter, Jr.

*Bibliographer*

### *Editorial Board*

Sara Arlen

Arthur H. Nethercot

Raymond F. Bosworth

Benjamin C. Rosset

Felix Grendon

Warren S. Smith

Archibald Henderson

Maxwell Steinhardt

David Marshall Holtzmann

*Treasurer*

T. Rowland Slingsluff

*Director of The Pennsylvania State University Press*

*The Shaw Review* is available exclusively to members of The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and to libraries. A special subscription rate of \$3 per year is offered to libraries. Members may order extra copies of current numbers at 50 cents each. Back numbers (Vol. I, Nos. 3, 7, 9, and 10, and Vol. II, Nos. 1-9) are available at \$1 each.

*The Shaw Review* is published three times annually — January, May, and September — by The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and The Pennsylvania State University Press. Copyright 1960 by The Shaw Society of America, Inc. All rights reserved. No material may be reprinted either wholly or in part without permission.

Address all communications concerning subscriptions and manuscript contributions to *The Shaw Review*, 221 Sparks Building, University Park, Pa. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed but will be returned only if return postage is provided. In matters of style *The Shaw Review* follows the *MLA Style Sheet*.

# THE SHAW REVIEW

Vol. III, No. 1

January, 1960

## Contents

The Bishop, the Dancer, and Bernard Shaw	Warren S. Smith	2
Comic Catharsis in <i>Caesar and Cleopatra</i>	Gordon W. Couchman	11
The Cleopatra Rug Scene: Another Source	George W. Whiting	15
Oh, Bottom, Thou Art Translated!	John J. Weisert	18
St. Pancras Manifesto		21
A Continuing Check-List of Shaviana	Charles A. Carpenter	32
Reviews		
<i>Heartbreak House</i> Revived	Paul Kozelka	38
<i>The Devil's Disciple</i> on the Screen	Maxwell Steinhardt	39
Notes and Queries		42

*We are made wise not by the recollections of our past, but by the responsibilities of our future.*

— Zoo, in *Back to Methuselah*

# The Bishop, the Dancer, and Bernard Shaw

by Warren S. Smith<sup>1</sup>

Shaw, in his long lifetime, spent a good many hours and thousands of words arguing on stage morals and censorship. Usually, as when he was arguing on behalf of his own plays or when he was appearing before a Parliamentary Committee, he was held quite close to the problem of the Lord Chamberlain's authority over the licensing of theatres in England. But in one notable exchange<sup>2</sup> with the Bishop of Kensington that seems to have received scant attention he managed to take the issue briefly and brilliantly into the wider areas of religion and morality. This was in November of 1913 and was occasioned by the French variety artiste, Gaby Deslys.

I bring up the matter now, because out of the poverty of our present criticism I can find no words that speak as eloquently to the condition of our mass entertainment industry as some of those Shaw addressed to our more innocent parents (or grandparents).

It will be entertaining, perhaps, if not very instructive, to know something of the catalyst. Gaby Deslys was used to creating sensations. She was a slim, well modeled blonde from Marseilles, who made no pretense to great artistry. Her real name was Madeline Caire but on stage she had become "Gabrielle of the Lilies." She loved audiences and they loved her—to the extent that she left a fortune of several million francs when she died of a throat infection in 1920 at the age of thirty-six. She was noted, among other things, for her stage wardrobe and the way she wore it—and, apparently, on occasion, for the way she did not wear it—and she became in her time familiar with police action and censorship in a number of localities including, naturally, Boston.

Her lure, however, must have been something more than that of a common leg-artist. Prior to the overthrow of the Portuguese government, the youthful King Manuel, so gossip said, showered jewels upon her with scandalous disregard for the state coffers. And at her death she was mourned by the Duc de Crussol, who had followed her to Paris at her final illness and who fled afterwards to America to forget his sorrow. These reports are in addition to such casual evidence as the necessity for the police, on one of her American tours, to remove forcibly from the stage two Yale students in pursuit of her.

On the first of September, 1913, Gaby opened in London in a show called *A la Carte* at the Palace Theatre (a variety house) under the management of Alfred Butt. (Note: On the same evening *Androcles and the Lion* opened, and had even a shorter run than *A la Carte*. It provoked cries in the press of "sacrilege" and "decadence.") Gaby's

<sup>1</sup> An Associate Professor of Theatre Arts at The Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Smith is also a member of The Shaw Review's Editorial Board.

<sup>2</sup> Acknowledgement is made to the Public Trustee, the Society of Authors and The Times of London for permission to quote from the letters of Bernard Shaw; and to Sir John Maud and The Times for permission to quote from the letters of the Bishop of Kensington.



show was a standard revue, apparently in no way remarkable except for her own glamorous presence in it. Even so it had trouble running, and after a couple of weeks some changes were made. "The Gaby Glide has been added," *The Times* reported, "but even the strenuousness of that remarkable tangle could not conquer the irrepressible Mlle. Deslys or her equally energetic dancing partner, Mr. Harry Pilcer, last night." There were the usual comedians and chorus.

Now apparently the Lord Chamberlain's representative, in compliance with British law, had routinely witnessed the original show and the changes. But about the time when the Gaby Glide was added to the show, some complaints were made to local clergymen that Gaby's revue was indecent. The clergy ostensibly avoided going to the theatre themselves, but they later claimed to have made "careful and independent" inquiries and came to the conclusion that the performance was "suggestive" (which was to become a key word in the argument). Eventually the Church of England had to do its duty and expose to Gaby and her troupe an actual clergyman, Dr. W. S. Magowan of St. Anne's, Soho, who attended, pen in hand, and — literally — made a list. The list was sent with a letter of complaint to the Lord Chamberlain over the signature of the Bishop of Kensington himself, Dr. John Primatt Maud.

With what seems from this distance remarkable deference to the clergy, the Lord Chamberlain's office dispatched the MacGowan list to Manager Butt with instructions that all the items on it be "rectified," and with a warning that his show would henceforth be kept under constant surveillance. Then, from the Lord Chamberlain's office, Col. Sir Douglas Dawson wrote the clergy a note of personal reassurance.

Here, fortunately for us, the clergy made a serious mistake in judgment. Presuming victory a little prematurely, they published Sir Douglas's letter, though it is clear he had not intended it for the public. Mr. Butt, therefore, very reasonably insisted that his reply to the Lord Chamberlain should also be made public, and the issue was then open for comment.

Manager Butt turned out to be embarrassingly articulate. He took up a number of the MacGowan points: "The incident of Mlle. Deslys powdering her legs (which, by the way, are fully covered) is purely a piece of light-spirited tomfoolery, and so far as I know has never been objected to by anyone." And the Gaby Glide, a descent of the stairs, though not in the Manager's own opinion graceful, certainly was not indecent.

To which, a few days later, Gaby herself added a touch of sentimental melodrama. "I know the admirable work that clergymen do. I know how they go into the slums and do their duty in the squalor of wretched hovels in the midst of revolting scenes and surroundings." Well why, she wanted to know, didn't they come and see *her*? Why didn't they see her show or at least come and talk with her? She assured *The Times* readers that respectable people came to the Palace; they neither held up their hands in horror nor walked out on the show. "My dancing is acrobatic dancing; the same twists and turns

occur in it as acrobats use in their tricks; certainly the same as done by hundreds of other dancers. If I do them with more brio than most, it is because I am enjoying the fun of it as well as the audience."

The Bishop of Kensington prepared his reply to the Palace Theatre with care and it was a full week before it appeared in print. In the meantime he took the precaution of sending the Rev. Dr. Macgowan back to the Palace, this time with a layman "whose long experience and tried judgment in such matters entitles him to the greatest respect." (!) Their mission was to determine whether in fact the performance *had* been changed and the public consequently "protected." The report of these gentlemen was that although the structure and dialogue remained unaltered, the "objectionable" parts had been altered or eliminated. Though this might sound equivocal to some, it was apparently by this time enough for the Bishop, who assured the public that since Monday the 20th of October the changes requested by the clergy had been made.

The Bishop took the opportunity to say something about the motives behind all this. Certainly he and his fellow clergy had no personal prejudice against Mlle. Deslys. For more than a year they had been feeling uneasy about the tendency of the variety houses to introduce "undesirable and often highly dangerous" incidents into sketches after they had been sanctioned by the Lord Chamberlain. They used the Palace incident to call public attention to the "suggestive representations which made their appeal to the sensual and passionate instincts. . . ." They were particularly concerned about the Young, whom they pictured as wandering into such theatres all unsuspecting.

At last, on the eighth of November, appeared a long letter from Bernard Shaw beginning, "May I, as a working playwright, ask the Bishop of Kensington to state his fundamental position clearly?" The Bishop responded promptly, of course, and for the next week *The Times* was forced to devote a daily column to letters under the heading, MR. SHAW ON MORALS. Most of the eighteen letters dealt not at all with what went on at the Palace, but with what Mr. Shaw had said. The abrupt discontinuance of the column at the end of the week was obviously imposed by the editors.

Only the wronged manager kept arguing the unfairness to his *A la Carte*. But readers had more brilliant fireworks now. The battle of moralities remains, even now, undecided; but in the temporal world of London the Bishop won his victory. The enticing Gaby was banished. Her show had closed and Mr. Butt reluctantly issued a statement that he had released Mlle. Deslys so that she could sail for America.

"Released?" remarked the dear old lady in *Punch* the following week. "I had no idea the impudent little baggage had been sent to prison. I hope it will be a lesson to her."

In the battle of moralities it was Shaw against the field. His altercation with the censor had been almost continuous since 1898 when he first applied for a license for *Mrs. Warren's Profession*; and now

spurred on by the recent puritanical attacks on *Androcles*, he was both stimulated and prepared. He boldly set the terms and the rest of London supported or refuted.

I have tried to organize the debate under four general queries.

1. *Is not some form of censorship inescapable?*

Almost all the correspondents, including those of the theatrical profession, assumed that it was. H. B. Irving, writing from the Savoy Theatre, could only conclude:

There must be some ultimate authority . . . efficient in its organization, methodical in its inspection, and drastic in its regulations.

Henry Arthur Jones, noting that it was impossible to censor "gestures, looks, by-play" in advance, actually advocated the establishment of an office of Inspector General, which would place observers in every theatre for every performance. Even the Bishop doubted the efficacy of that.

Elsewhere Shaw, too, had accepted the impartial enforcement of decency laws (as opposed to the caprices of the Lord Chamberlain's censorship), but in the present exchange he left the control of theatre morals wholly in the hands of the public:

I venture to suggest that when the Bishop heard that there was an objectionable (to him) entertainment at the Palace Theatre, the simple and natural course for him was not to have gone there. That is how sensible people act. And the result is that if a manager offers a widely objectionable entertainment to the public he very soon finds out his mistake and withdraws it. It is my own custom as a playwright to make my plays "suggestive" of religious emotion. This makes them extremely objectionable to irreligious people. But they have the remedy in their own hands. They stay away. The Bishop will be glad to hear there are not many of them. . . .

But the Bishop did not want to risk the public's contamination. He insisted that the censor had a job to do. And it was his "fundamental position" simply that sketches should not be altered after the Lord Chamberlain had approved them. On this single point he would have been happy to limit the argument.

I do not wish to obscure that position by yielding to Mr. Shaw's invitation to follow him in a discussion of those paradoxes which to any normally thinking man carry their refutation on the surface.

Shaw found the Bishop's preoccupation with regulations instead of morals simply "an astonishing episcopal reply."

2. *Is anyone qualified to judge what is "suggestive," "objectionable," "undesirable," "highly dangerous"? Does not such presumption infringe upon individual rights?*

Shaw accused the Bishop of using words like "suggestive" and "objectionable" as if there were a general agreement as to their meanings.

On the face of it the Bishop of Kensington is demanding that the plays he happens to like shall be tolerated and those which he happens not

to like shall be banned. He is assuming that what he approves of is right, and what he disapproves of, wrong. Now, I have not seen the particular play which he so much dislikes; but suppose that I go to see it tonight, and write a letter to you tomorrow to say that I approve of it, what will the Bishop have to say? He will have either to admit that his epithet of objectionable means simply disliked by the Bishop of Kensington, or he will have to declare boldly that he and I stand in relation of God and the Devil. And, however his courtesy and modesty may recoil from this extremity, when it is stated in plain English, I think he has got there without noticing it. At all events, he is clearly proceeding on the assumption that his conscience is more enlightened than that of the people who go to the Palace Theatre and enjoy what they see there. If the Bishop may shut up the Palace Theatre on this assumption, then the Nonconformist patrons of the Palace Theatre (and it has many of them) may shut up the Church of England by turning the assumption inside out. The sword of persecution always has two edges.

. . .

By "suggestive" the Bishop means suggestive of sexual emotion. . . . The suggestion, gratification, and education of the sexual emotion is one of the main uses and glories of the theatre. It shares that function with all the fine arts.

. . .

. . . the Bishop and his friends are not alone in proposing their own tastes and convictions as the measure of what is permissible in the theatre. But if such individual and sectarian standards were tolerated we should have no plays at all, for there never yet was a play that did not offend somebody's taste.

But the Bishop denied any intention to impose his personal tastes on the public. He believed that "suggestive" and "objectionable" *could* have generally accepted meanings. And obviously he did not mean suggestive of the kind of sexual emotion engendered by contemplating works of fine art!

I think further that I can assert that had Mr. Shaw himself seen the incidents in the performance at the Palace Theatre to which we directed protest, and which were promptly eliminated and altered, even he would have found difficulty in discovering there the suggestion of that kind of "sexual emotion" which he describes as "one of the main uses and glories of the theatre."

("As to that, I can only say," Shaw concluded in his final letter, "that if the Bishop sets out to suppress all the institutions of which I disapprove, he will soon have not one single supporter, not even/ Yours truly. . . .")

In spite of the quip one must feel that neither Shaw nor the Bishop was on very solid ground here. It is true that whether Shaw would have approved of the performance or not was wholly beside the point. On the other hand, the Bishop might properly have asked if Shaw's analogies between sex and the arts would have been so

exalted if the Puritan had been capable of looking at a really lewd performer.

The argument had spread from the press to the pulpit, and when the Bishop of London devoted his sermon to supporting the "vigorous campaign for a clean, pure life," Shaw characteristically applauded that sentiment with enthusiasm. However . . .

[The Bishop of London] is reported to have declared that, "It has been said that no Christian Church has any right to criticize any play in London." It may be that there exists some abysmal fool who said this. If so, he was hardly worth the Bishop of London's notice. The Christian Church ought to criticize every play in London; and it is on that right and duty of criticism, not on the unfortunate Lord Chamberlain, that the Christian Church ought to rely, and, indeed, would rely without my prompting if it were really a Christian Church.

And this leads us to the more penetrating questions.

3. *Can the theatre ever be wholly separated from its religious impulses? Does the Church continue subconsciously to regard the theatre as a rival?*

It was to questions of this nature that the Bishop did not wish to "yield," assuming them to be mere "paradoxes." Few readers today, I think, would consider them unrelated to censorship and stage morals, but in 1913 only one correspondent (a Ronald Campbell Macfie) challenged Shaw's pronouncements linking the theatre with the church and he very briefly. For one thing, the matching of sexual intemperance to religious intemperance was too outrageous to bear comment. For another, very likely, none of the debaters wished to risk further public hassle with the Great Contender, then fifty-seven and at the height of his powers both in print and lecture hall, on a subject in which he was considered heretical but expert — his City Temple lectures as well as a growing number of scenes and prefaces having already established him as a brilliant critical thinker about religion. "The theatre," he said, "is the Church's most formidable rival in forming the minds and guiding the souls of the people."

So closely related are the Church and the stage that for every objectionable feature, for every area of bad taste in the one, there is a counterpart in the other.

I must remind the Bishop that if the taste for voluptuous entertainment is sometimes morbid, the taste for religious edification is open to precisely the same objection. If I had a neurotic daughter I would much rather risk taking her to the Palace Theatre than to a revival meeting. Nobody has yet counted the homes and characters wrecked by intemperance in religious emotion. When we begin to keep such statistics the chapel may find its attitude of moral superiority to the theatre, and even to the publichouse hard to maintain, and may learn a little needed charity. We all need to be reminded of the need for temperance and toleration in religious emotion and in political emotion, as well as in sexual emotion.

(It was here that Macfie took exception. Although he did not defend "religious extravagance" he felt we owe it to religious liberty to tolerate



it. Not so with immorality. "Religious tolerance is one thing, moral tolerance is another.") Shaw continues:

But the Bishop must not conclude that I want to close up all the places of worship: on the contrary, I preach in them. I do not even clamor for the suppression of political party meetings, though nothing more foolish and demoralizing exists in England today. I live and let live. As long as I am not compelled to attend revival meetings, or party meetings, or theatres at which the sexual emotions are ignored or reviled, I am prepared to tolerate them on reciprocal terms; for though I am unable to conceive any good coming to any human being as a set-off to their hysteria, their rancorous bigotry, and their dullness and falsehood, I know that those who like them are equally unable to conceive of any good coming of the sort of assemblies I frequent; so I mind my own business and obey the old precept—"He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still; and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still; and he that is righteous let him do righteousness still; and he that is holy, let him be made holy still." For none of us can feel quite sure in which category the final judgment may place us; and in the meantime Miss Gaby Deslys is as much entitled to the benefit of the doubt as the Bishop of Kensington.

*4. Will not censorship always confuse voluptuousness with morbidity? What is the nature of evil in this case? And can you suppress the power for evil without suppressing also the power for good?*

A discerning correspondent who signed himself E.A.B. voiced what was to become a familiar criticism of Shaw—that he was indulging in "the passion of pure reason." Morality for Shaw, he said, was a subject for dialectics rather than for conduct; and it was E.A.B. who reduced the question in essence to: "What is the nature of evil?" Christian ethics tend to regard the body as evil. The Church, he noted, deplores sex but condones it, with much the same attitude it takes toward war. But Shaw was an "ultraChristian," obsessed like his own John Tanner by the divine life force. For such a person when, if ever, is sex immoral? When it is "the conscious glorification of a means to an end," E.A.B. answered himself, and the Reverend T. A. Lacey was quick to point out that this was precisely the view of Saint Augustine.

Without disputing such a definition of "immoral sex" Shaw observed how impossible the application of such a standard would be, since

. . . men have worshipped Venuses and fallen in love with Virgins. There is a voluptuous side to religious ecstasy and a religious side to voluptuous ecstasy; and the notion that one is less sacred than the other is the opportunity of the psychiatrist who seeks to discredit the saints by showing that the passion which was exalted in them was in its abuse capable also of degrading sinners.

Such religious-voluptuous emotional complexity makes it impossible to "dissect out the evil of the theatre and strike at that alone."

One man seeing a beautiful actress will feel that she has made all common debaucheries impossible to him; another, seeing the same actress in the same part, will plunge straight into those debaucheries because

he has seen her body without being able to see her soul. Destroy the actress and you rob the first man of his salvation without saving the second from the first woman he meets on the pavement.

One of the contributors slyly "confessed" that GBS had almost convinced him, at this point, that the same emotion was stimulated by the Venus de Milo as by a pornographic photo. Here again one must pause, I think, to marvel at Shaw's inability to conceive of real lewdness or pornography. While what he says about the beautiful actress must have been many times proved, it is hard to conceive of anyone renouncing all "common debaucheries" on behalf, say, of a grind-and-bump performer!

This does not necessarily invalidate Shaw's position for it may well be impossible to "dissect out the evil" from even the most salacious performance; but it does leave a blind spot in Shaw's view of the theatre and the world, and in a sense leaves the Bishop of Kensington and the National Vigilance Committee curiously unanswered in regard to the existence of the crudest carnality.

But freethinkers in 1913 were still in the first wave of revolt from a prudery that regarded the least voluptuous art as indecent, and Shaw was more concerned with the effects of such "starvation" than with the effects of commercial sensuality.

We have families who bring up their children in the belief that an undraped statue is an abomination; that girl or youth who looks at a picture by Paul Veronese is corrupted for ever; that the theatre . . . is the gate of hell; and that the contemplation of a figure attractively dressed or revealing more of its outline than a Chinaman's dress does is an act of the most profligate indecency. Of Chinese sex morality I must not write in the pages of *The Times*. Of the English and Scottish sex morality that is produced by this starvation and blasphemous vilification of the vital emotions I will say only this: that it is so morbid and abominable, so hatefully obsessed by the things that tempt it, so merciless in its persecution of all the divine grace which grows in the soil of our sex instincts when they are not deliberately perverted and poisoned, that if it could be imposed, as some people would impose it if they could, on the whole community for a single generation, the Bishop, even at the risk of martyrdom, would reopen the Palace Theatre with his episcopal benediction, and implore the lady to whose performances he now objects to return to the stage even at the sacrifice of the last rag of her clothing.

In spite of Shaw's lucid rhetoric it seems to have escaped many of the correspondents that he remained the strictest of moralists. They seem to imply that he denied the existence of evil, whereas nothing could have been farther from his intent. His position in these letters, as elsewhere, was that morality must be imposed by self-discipline and that dependence upon the censor is the easiest excuse for immorality. Both art and religion are powers for evil as well as for good, but a man must choose his own salvation or damnation.

An evil sermon — and there are many more evil sermons than evil plays — may do frightful harm; but is the Bishop ready to put on the chains he would fasten on the playwright, and agree that no sermon

should be preached unless it is first read and licensed by the Lord Chamberlain? No doubt it is easier to go to sleep than to watch and pray; that is why everyone is in favour of securing purity and virtue and decorum by paying an official to look after them. But the result is that your official, who is equally indisposed to watch and pray, takes the simple course of forbidding everything that is not customary; and, as as nothing is customary except vulgarity, the result is that he kills the thing he was employed to purify and leaves the nation to get what amusement they can out of its putrefaction. Our souls are to have no adventures because adventures are dangerous.

All this was in November, 1913, and some of it may belong strictly to the past. But there are sentences, like the last one quoted, that must seem far more bitter today than they could ever have been in terms of the London theatre an extended generation ago.

- - - - -

## FROM THE SHAVIAN PAST II

*Undergraduates' Practical Joke at Oxford.* — Mr. Bernard Shaw, the well-known Socialist, who has been on a visit to Oxford, was, late on Saturday night, the victim of a practical joke on the part of some undergraduates. Whilst a meeting was being held in the rooms of Mr. Best, in the new buildings of Magdalen College, which face the High-street, the outer door was screwed up, and it is said that cayenne pepper was heated in the vicinity, and a most unpleasant odor produced, whereupon those who were present discovered that they had all been made prisoners. When an attempt was made by some of them to escape by letting themselves down from the windows a copious supply of dirty water was poured from above. Ultimately the attention of the authorities was attracted by the uproar, and the inhabitants of the room were liberated shortly before midnight.

— *The Times* (London), Tuesday,  
February 23, 1892.



# Comic Catharsis in *Caesar and Cleopatra*

by Gordon W. Couchman<sup>1</sup>

When Bernard Shaw, in the Preface to *Three Plays for Puritans*, attacked Shakespeare's presentation of Caesar, Antony, and Cleopatra, he was letting us know that he had something very different in mind when he wrote his own Roman play. Even without the Preface, we could not fail to see that Shaw's comedy, which he subtitled "A History Lesson," is a play with a purpose. And if we look closely we can see that this purpose is really two-fold. On one level, Shaw's comedy is a take-off, a spoof, of Shakespeare's Roman heroes and Egyptian (or Macedonian) heroine. On another level it depicts a new kind of hero, and in so doing, suggests a conflict within Shaw himself.

The ingredients in Shaw's recipe for spoofing Shakespeare are simple enough. The epileptic Caesar of Shakespeare, the controversial Caesar whom Cassius scornfully tells of rescuing from the Tiber, is shown in Shaw's play exultantly diving from the lighthouse of Alexandria into the harbor. The Caesar over whose corpse Antony assures the people that they will "beg a hair of him in memory" is shown by Shaw futilely trying to hide his baldness with the oak wreath (it is a laurel wreath in Suetonius' chronicle). The victim of hubris who in Shakespeare's tragedy exclaims: "Hence, wilt thou lift up Olympus?" appears in Shaw's comedy using a sacred incense burner as a stool to sit on while settling Egyptian affairs. The Caesar who loftily goes on about cowards who die many times before their deaths is described by Shaw's Rufio as an incorrigible sermonizer. The entire scene at the lighthouse of Alexandria is Shaw's comic version of the monument scene in *Antony and Cleopatra*: Shakespeare's heroine buckling on Antony's armor to the accompaniment of grandiose verse finds her comedy counterpart in Shaw's Cleopatra dressing Caesar for battle and in the process gleefully discovering that Caesar is bald. Shaw borrows Shakespeare's Charmian and Iras, but Shaw's Charmian is "a hatchet faced, terra cotta colored little goblin, swift in her movements, and neatly finished at the hands and feet," while Iras "is a plump, good-natured creature, rather fatuous, with a profusion of red hair, and a tendency to giggle on the slightest provocation." Charmian calls Caesar "Old hooknose" and accuses Caesar (though not to his face) of making Cleopatra "terribly prosy and serious."

The character of Cleopatra herself is straight out of Plutarch's life of Antony, where we are told that Caesar's "acquaintance was with her as a girl, young and ignorant of the world, but she was to meet Antony in the time of her life when women's beauty is most splendid and their intellects are in full maturity." (Dryden-Clough tr.) In the

<sup>1</sup> Professor Couchman is chairman of the English Department at Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois.

opening Sphinx scene in the desert, a scene that has been often praised, Cleopatra is a child; when, as she supposes, she is about to meet Caesar, it is Caesar himself who, in one of the wise moments of the play, must nerve her for the ordeal:

Caesar [*admiring Cleopatra, and placing the crown on her head*]

Is it sweet or bitter to be a Queen, Cleopatra?

Cleopatra. Bitter.

Caesar. Cast out fear; and you will conquer Caesar.

In Act IV Cleopatra herself testifies to the fact that she is growing up: "Do you speak with Caesar," she tells Pothinus, "every day for six months, and you will be changed." But though Caesar freely admits his susceptibility to women, he is so little stirred by Cleopatra that he almost forgets to say goodbye to her when he leaves Egypt.

Both Cleopatra and Caesar's officer, Rufio, serve a purpose which if we did not know better, we might almost think was to debunk Caesar. Cleopatra's giggling at Caesar's baldness already has been mentioned; at the outset of the play, in the scene in the desert, she addresses Caesar pointedly as "old gentleman," and Caesar later demands of her, "Do you like to be reminded that you are very young? . . . Neither do I like to be reminded that I am — middle aged." In the scene at the lighthouse Rufio offers Caesar some dates as a remedy for Caesar's low spirits: "When a man comes to your age, he runs down before his midday meal." When later in the same scene Caesar prepares to dive from the lighthouse after Apollodorus, Rufio demands in consternation: "Can an old fool dive and swim like a young one? He is twenty-five and you are fifty."

Since, in this same scene, Caesar himself good-naturedly refers to himself as an old man, and later contrasts himself unfavorably with the twenty-five year old Apollodorus, it is fair to assume that Shaw is not debunking Caesar but merely humanizing him, bringing him down off his pedestal in order to elevate him in Shaw's own way later. Shaw called Enobarbus an example of Shakespeare's "bogus characterization" in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and it is hard to believe that Rufio is not Shaw's answer to Shakespeare at this point also. ("Mainly about Shakespear," *Our Theatres in the Nineties*, III, 147.) Rufio frequently expresses a comic disgust with Caesar which roughly parallels Enobarbus' attitude toward Antony, although Caesar allows Rufio liberties not permitted Enobarbus. More than once Rufio breaks out in a rage at Caesar's impatience to have his orders carried out; cutting the historical Caesar down to size, he refers at one point to Caesar's "accursed clemency," at another to "generals subject to fits of clemency." He more than once scolds Caesar for "fooling" with Cleopatra. More pointedly, he accuses Caesar of "always having a birthday when there is a pretty girl to be flattered or an ambassador to be conciliated." The Caesar who, in Shakespeare's play, expresses his contempt for those who fear death is to Rufio only the Caesar who spouts the same sermon about life and death at every opportunity: "Ass!" exclaims Rufio disgustedly when Pothinus tries to warn Caesar of danger, "Now we shall have some heroics." When Caesar becomes lyrical

about exploring the source of the Nile, Rufio merely remarks: "Ay: now he will conquer Africa with two legions before we come to the roast boar" – possibly Shaw's version of Enobarbus' "Now he'll outstare the lightning."

But it is Rufio nevertheless whom Caesar calls "his shield" in making him governor of Egypt, and Rufio it is who says that he is unwilling to let Caesar go back to Rome without him for "There are too many daggers there." Rufio it is likewise who helps point up the contrast between Antony and Caesar, the contrast in which, as critics like Wilhelm Rehbach and William Irvine have suggested, lies the real force of Shaw's play. "You are a bad hand at a bargain, mistress," says Rufio to Cleopatra at the end, "if you will swop Caesar for Antony." Rehbach has called attention to the scene at the lighthouse when Cleopatra begs Caesar not to leave her alone, and Caesar, ready for battle with the Egyptians, crushes her. "Cleopatra:" says Caesar, "when that trumpet sounds, we must take every man his life in his hand, and throw it in the face of Death. And of my soldiers who have trusted me there is not one whose hand I shall not hold more sacred than your head." "What a contrast," exclaims Rehbach, "to Shakespeare's Antonius." ("Shaw's 'Besser als Shakespeare,'" *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, LII [1916], 117.) Here Shaw is no longer merely taking off Shakespeare: as the Caesar who presently leaps exultantly into the harbor is Shaw's answer to the "travesty" of Shakespeare's epileptic braggart, so the Caesar who thus rebukes the thoughtless Queen is Shaw's answer to the Antony who followed Cleopatra in ignominious flight at Actium.

And here we come back to Shaw's Preface to *Three Plays for Puritans*, where Shaw attacks Shakespeare's Caesar and Antony for their failure as heroes. But there is more to it than this. It is impossible, says Shaw in effect, to take these characters seriously; they are, in fact, more than a little ridiculous. It is Shaw's Caesar, with all his human frailties upon him, who is the true hero. The Caesar who says in Act IV, "He who has never hoped can never despair," may himself be somewhat romanticized after Shaw's own fashion, but he is at all events in no danger of becoming a victim either of hubris or self-indulgence.

In his biography of Shaw, Hesketh Pearson says that *Caesar and Cleopatra* contains "incomparably the best of Shaw's self-portraits." (*G.B.S.: A Full-Length Portrait* [N. Y., 1942] p. 189.) If this assertion is true – and there is certainly something in it – it gives us perhaps the final key to Shaw's comedy as a take-off on Shakespeare. Much has been made of the fact that Shaw apparently felt a sneaking admiration for the hero, the strong man, the man of action. In fairness to Shaw it must be said that at any rate his hero is subject to the same lively sense of the ridiculous that Shaw brought to bear on Shakespeare. Was Shaw not, in depicting his own Caesar, actually resolving a conflict within himself? "The demand now," says Shaw in one place, "is for heroes in whom we can recognize our own humanity." ("Bernard Shaw and the Heroic Actor," *Play Pictorial*, X [Oct. 1907], 110.) Caesar is Shaw's idea of what a hero should be:

a man strong both inwardly and outwardly, at once efficient and magnanimous, idealistic yet devoid of illusions. But this Caesar's creator is not free to release his hero until he has first paid his respects to the comic muse; until, that is, he has had a good laugh both at his hero and at the strain of hero-worship in himself. By the same token, Shaw is not free to expose his conception of Caesar on the stage until he has first absolved his audiences of the guilt of indiscriminate hero-worship by giving them the same laugh at Caesar's expense. Thus Shaw accomplishes a dual purpose: to parody Shakespeare's heroes and to substitute for them a hero of his own. Thus also he achieves, for his audiences and himself, a kind of catharsis in comedy.

- - - - -

#### SCHEDULED FOR MAY:

Bernard Shaw and *The Interlude at the Playhouse*

by Myron Matlaw

What Shaw Really Thought of Americans

by Arthur H. Nethercot

Charles Surface and Shaw's Heroines

by Maurice Johnson

Bernard Shaw: Aspects and Problems of Research — the proceedings of the Conference of Scholars at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, December 28, 1959

# The Cleopatra Rug Scene: Another Source

by George W. Whiting<sup>1</sup>

In Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* one of the most spectacular episodes is that in which Cleopatra, aided by Ftateteeta and Apollodorus, contrives to have her enclosed in a rug and delivered by boat to Caesar, who is then engaged in a desperately forlorn attempt to save his outnumbered forces from annihilation by the hostile Egyptians. The first scene of Act III is the edge of a quay in front of the royal palace in Alexandria and looking out west over the east harbor to Pharos island and its famous lighthouse, which is joined to the mainland by a great mole or causeway five miles in length. The second scene (not separately numbered in the play, which has no scene divisions) is that in which Cleopatra, inclosed in the rug, is delivered on the causeway to Caesar — only almost at once to be pitched into the sea when the Egyptian attack develops. She is then rescued by Caesar, the mighty swimmer. Shaw professes to have taken his "chronicle" play "without alteration from Mommsen" — but this episode is not to be found in Mommsen's *History of Rome*.

The episode is related in Plutarch's life of Julius Caesar, which Shaw says he read along with a "lot of other stuff."<sup>2</sup> In Plutarch we read that Caesar "privately sent for *Cleopatra* from her retirement." The story proceeds:

She took a little Skiff, and one of her Confidants, *Apollodorus*, along with her, and in the Dusk of the Evening landed near the Palace. She was at a loss how to get in undiscover'd, 'till she thought of putting her self into the Coverlet of a Bed, and lying at length, whilst *Apollodorus* bound up the bedding, and carried it on his Back through the Castle-gates to *Caesar's* Apartment. *Caesar* was first taken with this fetch of *Cleopatra*, as an Argument of her Wit; and was afterwards so far charm'd with her Conversation and graceful Behaviour, that he reconcil'd her to her Brother and made her Partner in the Government.<sup>3</sup>

Plutarch later tells us that in an engagement near Pharos Caesar leaped from the mole into a skiff to aid his soldiers and that, still later, when the Egyptians pressed him on every side, he leaped into the sea and with much difficulty swam away. The incident of Cleopatra being delivered to Caesar in this way does not seem improbable. The "fetch" is accepted as an argument of her wit. On the contrary Shaw's entire episode is incredible and even fantastic — but dramatically very effective.

Although Plutarch is doubtless Shaw's "source," Shaw in his own farcical fashion was dealing with an incident which had previously

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Whiting is Professor Emeritus of English at The Rice Institute. One of his scholarly interests has been the inter-relationships of art and letters. *Milton and This Pendant World* (1958) is his most recent book.

<sup>2</sup> Heskest Pearson, GBS, *A Full Length Portrait* (New York, 1942), p. 187.

<sup>3</sup> *The Fourth Volume of Plutarch's Lives* (London, 1711), pp. 416-417.



been depicted in art, in a painting that seems to have been well known to Victorian London. This painting is Gérôme's "celebrated" *Cléopâtre apportée à César dans un tapis*, which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1871. In *The Athenaeum* there is the following account:

According to the well-known story, Cleopatra, in order to escape the watchfulness of her enemies, is said to have caused Apollodorus to wrap her in a carpet, or, more probably, a piece of tapestry, and, thus concealed, to bear her to the room where Caesar sat. The scene chosen for this studied picture is Caesar's council-chamber, a large and lofty vaulted room, where he sat with his secretaries: Apollodorus has just set down his burden, the tall, dark-haired, serpent-like woman, and, stooping at her knees, removes the tapestry, which, while it reveals the queen, almost naked and gorgeously decorated, has fallen in heavy masses at her feet. Upright she stands, with one hand on the shoulder of the man, leaning her head sideways, and bending the dark fire of her eyes upon the Dictator, who does not appear so much startled as one would expect: he raises his face from the paper on which he was engaged, and lifts his hands with moderate surprise, or in the act of commanding his secretaries. M. Gerome has expended the resources of his art on the figure of Cleopatra, and succeeded in producing that which thoroughly characterizes himself in design; the subtlest passion, and that ineffable look of craft, concentrated in luxury, which she exhibits, are elements of a masterpiece, surpassing in exquisiteness even the figure of Phryne, in his equally famous picture.<sup>4</sup>

In the following description of Cleopatra color is emphasized:

Her hair is black as night, bound with a gold fillet, and jewelled with sacred *ureus* of Egypt; she is naked to the hips, except where a carcanet of green-blue, turquoise and black ornaments, in the Nilotic mode, and like a gorget for breadth — falls about her throat; a broad belt of gold, with straps passing below her breasts, binds her waist; from her hips a gold-embroidered white tissue, divided to show the lower limbs entire, falls to her feet, without pretending to be a covering.

This critic thinks that there are some defects in the drawing of Apollodorus and Caesar, but he declares that Cleopatra herself is subtly and admirably modelled and painted.

Although admitting that Gérôme is amazingly clever, another critic asserts that his contributions are "not over welcome to persons of refined or fastidious taste." This painting of Cleopatra "obtains more notice from gentlemen than from ladies." But it is not so much improper as disagreeable, he declares: the "flesh tones are black and opaque," and lack all the qualities admired in Titian. The best piece of painting is not Cleopatra but the carpet. He concludes by condemning this picture of "unblushing nudity."<sup>5</sup>

When it was exhibited at the Salon in 1866, under the title *César et Cléopâtre*, it was objected that the artist had reduced to the proportions of a familiar painting a scene which should have been painted in the grand style, and that Caesar, seated at the desk, resembles a clerk of the Senate; but, it was added, "*sa figure de Cléopâtre est*

<sup>4</sup> *The Athenaeum*, May 13 1871, p. 596.

<sup>5</sup> *The Art Journal*, N.S. X (1871), p. 174.

charmante, mais à la façon moderne."<sup>6</sup> No word of condemnation on moral grounds here.

Shaw says that the Sphinx scene (Act I of the play) was suggested by a French picture of the Flight into Egypt. Unable to remember the painter's name, he declares: "the engraving, which I saw in a shop window when I was a boy, of the Virgin and child asleep in the lap of a colossal Sphinx staring over a desert, so intensely still that the smoke of Joseph's fire close by went straight up like a stick, remained in the rummage basket of my memory for thirty years before I took it out and exploited it on the stage."<sup>7</sup>

It is true that Shaw did not come to London until the year 1876, five years after Gérôme's painting of Cleopatra was exhibited at the Academy. As is well known, he became an art critic, and from 1885 to 1889, it has been said, he criticized "every picture show in London." Although there is no definite proof — and the garrulous Shaw does not seem to mention this painting — it seems to me probable that Shaw knew of Gérôme's work and that it may have had some slight influence on the writing of Act III of *Caesar and Cleopatra*. I admit, of course, that, although potentially regal, Shaw's "divine child" does not greatly resemble Gérôme's dark-haired, serpent-like woman, who is much more the conventional Cleopatra. Gérôme's Queen would really belong in the play which Shaw professed his to be: "a chapter of Mommsen and a page of Plutarch furnished with scenery and dialogue,"<sup>8</sup> — a true historical chronicle, which Shaw had no desire to write.

He wrote instead what has been called a "tremendous fantasy," which at times borders upon crude melodrama and at times is a kind of undisguised farce, — but which, nevertheless, is generally an effective theatrical spectacle satisfying in Shaw's inimitable fashion his interpretation of what he called the modern demand for heroes — and heroines — in whom we recognize our own humanity. Only a Shaw devotee could seriously maintain that the play is "a combination of the most absolute fantasy with the most absolute truth."<sup>9</sup> I am very skeptical as to Shaw's command of absolute truth here. But I am persuaded that his version of the Cleopatra-rug episode<sup>11</sup> is abundant proof of his exuberant and undisciplined fancy, which was stimulated by Plutarch's life and perhaps by Gérôme's celebrated painting, which at the very least is evidence of contemporary interest in the Cleopatra-rug incident.

<sup>6</sup> *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XX (1866), pp. 816-817. In *La Grande Encyclopedie*, XVIII, 860, the title for this painting is *Cleopatra et Cesar* and the date is 1866. This is one of the numerous works that were the result of Gérôme's visit in 1857 to Egypt, where he acquired abundant local color and exact detail (*Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XIV, 335-336).

<sup>7</sup> Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-188.

<sup>8</sup> Archibald Henderson, *George Bernard Shaw, Man of the Century* (New York, 1956), p. 166.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 558.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 557.

<sup>11</sup> When Forbes-Robertson first produced the play at the Savoy, he omitted the entire third act, "with impunity," it is said; but after its success in Berlin the third act was restored (Henderson, p. 557, note 12).

# Oh, Bottom, Thou Art Translated!

by John J. Weisert<sup>1</sup>

When he heard of a cut made in the German *Caesar and Cleopatra*, Shaw damned Max Reinhardt to boil in brimstone through all eternity.<sup>2</sup> The imagination falters at devising the punishment a Shaw performance given a few years later under Reinhardt's auspices would have elicited, had Shaw learned the details.

Tilla Durieux, the creator in Germany of Jennifer Dudgeon and Eliza Higgins, relates them for us in her memoirs, *A Door Is Open* (*Eine Tür steht offen*). The episode was precipitated by Duse's sudden cancellation of a scheduled appearance at the Kammerspiele, the "arty" adjunct of the Deutsches Theater. Mrs. Durieux notes that she had accepted an invitation to the home of Samuel Fischer, the publisher, in anticipation of a free evening, so was at first vexed when Edmund Reinhardt informed her by telephone that *The Doctor's Dilemma* had been scheduled for the evening.

"I immediately objected angrily that I could not come," she writes,<sup>3</sup> "but to his question, why? I found no sensible answer and said the most stupid thing that occurred to me, namely, that my clothes were being cleaned. At his observation that not all of my clothes could be in this process, I had to confess that it was only a matter of the dress I wore in the last act. 'Well, then let us omit the last act,' was the generous answer, which rather stumped me. Of course, the fifth act is only an epilogue and could certainly be dispensed with; but on the program five acts were listed, and the public would want to see all five of them. However, that was not my concern, and the little gain in time was welcome. I could no longer refuse to appear now, for every contract invariably includes provisions for a sudden change of bill.

"My first scene came at 8:45, and punctually at 8:15 I was always in the dressing room to make the usual change of clothes. The first entrance of Mrs. Dudgeon occurs in a charming scene between the doctor and the artist's wife, who asks the physician to treat her husband. To enlist his interest, she brings the sketches of her husband in a large portfolio. Impelled more by her charm than by the talent of the painter, the great doctor accedes to her request.

"When I entered the theatre this evening at the usual time, I found the wardrobe mistress and the stage manager already waiting

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Weisert is Assistant Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

<sup>2</sup> C. B. Purdom, *Harley Granville Barker* (London: Rockliff [1955], p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Tilla Durieux, *Eine Tür steht offen* (Berlin-Grunewald: F. A. Herbig Verlagsbuchhandlung [1954]), pp. 100-102. Quoted with the permission of the publishers of the pocket edition, in the Non-Stop Bucherei, Berlin-Grunewald.



for me in some agitation. They allowed me no time to change, but shoved the portfolio of drawings under my arm at the instant I heard my cue. Non-plussed, I stood on the stage and was received by Wegener with the words: 'Aha, you are Mrs. Dudebat. You want me to treat your husband? Say nothing, leave the drawings alone, I am familiar with them from the other evening.' Then came the words necessary to ring down the curtain, and the first act was over. It had been an abbreviated rendition, and my puzzled eyes met the pleased eyes of the actors, who had already taken their places for the second act, prepared to go through that in the same hurried tempo.

"The auditorium was sparsely filled, for most people had expected the guest appearance of Duse and exchanged their tickets. Only some not familiar with our play had chosen to be satisfied with the substitute performance.

"After the third act I jokingly proposed to Moissi not to die today, but naturally did not anticipate that this suggestion would fall on fertile ground. The fourth act, you see, brings on stage Moissi (Dudebat) on the verge of death, sitting in a wheelchair, dressed only in a nightshirt with a blanket over his legs. All the doctors expect his death, and stand around him. His wife watches his face in despair and anguish. Then Moissi suddenly explained with gusto that he did not want to die. The doctors choked back their laughter, surrounded him and whispered softly: 'Moissi, for God's sake, you simply must die.' — 'I don't want to,' cried Moissi, and shouted it again and again amid the excited remarks of the colleagues. Finally, he said: 'At any rate, I shall not die here, take me to the next room, perhaps I shall die there.' General restlessness ensued. But I hastily left the set and ran into the wings, for I could no longer keep a straight face. Shortly afterwards, the doctors almost dying with laughter shoved Moissi off stage. Then I thought of the completely empty stage, and that the act would, after all, have to terminate somehow. I cried with all my strength, so as to be heard in the auditorium: 'My poor husband, he is dying, he is dying!' Moissi, however, stood up in the wheelchair, threw off the blanket, ran to the set door, opened it, showed himself to the audience in his nightshirt, and cried: 'No, I am not dead!' — Meanwhile, one of the doctors ran to the operator of the curtain and made him end the story.

"I doubt that we got any applause; however, I sat roaring with laughter in the dressing room, then changed quickly, in order to get to Fischer's. Having been excused from the fifth act, I was, therefore, through. We had played the piece at such a rate that I appeared as a guest at Fischer's quite early. An acquaintance, who by chance was in the theatre and had already seen the play, now told me the sequel. The audience waited patiently for the last act — it did not begin. The house manager dimmed the lights in order to drive the people out. They, however, thought the curtain was about to rise once more. There was nothing else to be done except to turn up the lights again and urge the spectators to go home. They pointed to the program, on which five acts were indicated. Then the embarrassed house manager maintained that one of the actors had been taken ill. But some people familiar with the piece and knowing that only Wegener and I ap-

peared in the last act, asked anxiously who of us two was sick. Driven into a corner, the manager admitted that Mrs. Durieux' costume had been taken to the cleaner. Then the cup overflowed. Raging and protesting, the audience moved to the Deutsches Theatre and demanded its money back.

"On the following day, there was to be a serious reprimand, in which, however, I was not concerned, since I had acted entirely with the consent of the director. Moissi, on the other hand, threatened to make public the fact that his name had been used on the placards during an entire tour, although he was somewhere else the whole time. So everything calmed down."

- - - - -

### FROM THE SHAVIAN PAST      III

*Lunching with Mr. and Mrs. Shaw in Adelphi Terrace was a somewhat curious experience. Mrs. Shaw was a very able manager, and used to provide Shaw with such a delicious vegetarian meal that the guests all regretted their more conventional menu. But he could not resist a somewhat frequent repetition of his favorite anecdotes. Whenever he came to his uncle, who committed suicide by putting his head in a carpet bag and then hanging it, a look of unutterable boredom used to appear on Mrs. Shaw's face, and if one was sitting next to her, one had to take care not to listen to Shaw. This, however, did not prevent her from solicitude for him. I remember a luncheon at which a young and lovely poetess was present in the hopes of reading her poems to Shaw. As we said goodbye Shaw informed us that she was staying behind for this purpose. Nevertheless, when we departed we found her on the mat, Mrs. Shaw having maneuvered her there by methods which I was not privileged to observe. Well, I learned not long afterwards [that] it was this lady who had cut her throat at Wells because he refused to make love to her. My respect for Mrs. Shaw became even greater than before.*

— Bertrand Russell, in an NBC broadcast,  
"They Knew Bernard Shaw,"  
March 27, 1955.

## St. Pancras Manifesto

Shaw held elective municipal office from 1897 to 1903 as Vestryman of the Parish of St. Pancras and (St. Pancras becoming a Borough under the London Government) Member of the Borough Council of St. Pancras. When his second term expired he stood as candidate for the Borough of St. Pancras in the London County Council, even though his concurrent activities in a dozen other fields pressed their claims upon his time. A campaign leaflet reported that Shaw's record in Borough Council was "192 attendances. These attendances were not merely nominal: each of them involved at least two hours' work at the Town Hall, and often three or four, Mr. Shaw being admittedly one of the most active and diligent of Committee Men." Running as Shaw's partner was Sir William Nevill M. Geary, whose stern aspect appeared opposite Shaw's bearded one on campaign pamphlets.

Although Shaw campaigned with the same zeal and energy with which he performed his municipal duties, it was soon apparent that he was losing ground – particularly, he thought later, because he was alienating the Nonconformist element by urging the improvement of Church schools even if it required public funds. He told Henderson an incident of the campaign:

I was convinced that such improvement would lead to the betterment of the education of the children. The Nonconformists were enraged beyond measure by the proposal, looking with the utmost horror upon any measure which tended to strengthen the Church [of England]. I remember one rabid Nonconformist coming to me one day, almost foaming at the mouth, and protesting with almost violent indignation that he would not pay a single cent towards the maintenance of the schools of the Established Church. "Why, my dear fellow," I replied, "don't you know that you pay taxes now for the support of the Roman Catholic Church in the Island of Malta?" Although this staggered the irate Nonconformist for the moment, it did not reconcile his element to the extension of the principle to London. My contention was that under the conditions prevailing at the time, the children were poorly taught and poorly housed, the schools badly ventilated, and the conditions generally unsatisfactory. "Improve all the conditions," I said; "appoint your own inspectors, and in the course of time you will control the situation. Pay the piper and you can call the tune." But I could not override the tremendous prejudice against the [Established] Church. . . .

The Fabians threw the weight of their increasing numbers and political skill into the local battle. Printed white post cards arrived in the mail of Fabian Society members:

41 Grosvenor Road.

### L. C. C. Election

Bernard Shaw is fighting a very difficult election in South St. Pancras, and can only be successful if at least five hundred workers come to his help. With such assistance his return could be ensured. *This means that the result depends on the members of the F. S.* I am going to organise half the constituency from next Saturday. Will you not come to the Committee Room at 81 Judd Street Road (close to Midland Terminus), (i) on Saturday afternoon, 27th February; (ii) on any

afternoon or evening next week; (iii) above all, on Polling Day, 5th March? WORK WILL WIN.

Sidney Webb

Although Shaw was badly beaten, it was not totally discomfoting to the Webbs, who had grave misgivings about the Irishman's campaign methods — his "cold drawn truth, ruthlessly administered" and his refusal to adopt the "orthodox devices" of appealing to sectional interests, as Beatrice Webb confided to her diary on March 7, 1904. He was "hopelessly intractable" as a campaigner, she thought, and might have proven equally impolitic if swept into office with a large majority. "We are not wholly grieved. . . ."

One of the major legacies of GBS's venture into municipal politics is the tract, *The Common Sense of Municipal Trading* (London, 1904). Another is the manifesto which appeared over the names of both Geary and Shaw as a campaign platform. The language and form of its fifteen pages have the ring of Shaw's prefaces, although it is signed by both men.

S.W.

DEAR SIR,

We have been requested by the Progressive Association in South St. Pancras to offer ourselves for election at the forthcoming County Council Election on the 5th March.

As the Progressive Association is the only representative body in the division that keeps strictly to municipal questions and is independent of the parliamentary parties, we have accepted the invitation, and hope you will confirm it by voting for us on the first Saturday in March.

#### THE EDUCATION BILL

There is no doubt that the question which will be uppermost at the election is that of the administration of the London Education Act by the new Council. On that question we stand for Education and for Tolerance. We are personally ready to work, and to work ungrudgingly, for the Education of the children of London, without asking whether their parents be Established Churchmen, Free Churchmen, Roman Catholics or Jews. We recognise that without perfect Toleration, public education is impossible. If you elect us you may depend on us for one thing at least, and that is, that however strongly the citizens of London may differ from one another on sectarian questions, the children of London shall not suffer for it if we can help it.

#### THE CHURCH SCHOOLS

What is it that we feel most strongly about the Church schools? Is it that the children are taught the Church catechism? Not at all. What concerns us is the fact that the children in the Church schools seldom win the County Council scholarships, that the school buildings are often inferior and insanitary, that there are not teachers enough, that what teachers there are are always underpaid and sometimes under-qualified, and that the clergyman is forced to beg, often literally from door to door, to make both ends meet. The Education Act gives the London County Council for the first time the power and the means to make an end of this; to have the schools rebuilt and fully staffed, the teachers properly qualified, well paid, and raised to the rank of public servants, the clergyman relieved from his dependence on the purses of a small minority of his parishioners, and the children given the same advantages for their start in life as the Board children now possess. For

such purposes the Act provides Government grants amounting to over £500 a day without recourse to the rates. We confess it would take something more than the Church Catechism and the acceptance of four nominees of the Church on the subordinate committees of managers, to stay our hands from this good work. And what we would do for the Church children, we would do also for all London's children who need it, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Unitarian, and those who are lost to all the Churches through the indifference bred by bad social conditions.

We cannot believe that there is a Free Churchman in the constituency so bigoted as to refuse to say Amen to this with all his heart, or an Established Churchman who will quarrel with us for our plain speaking as to the straits to which many Church schools have been reduced by poverty.

Only, we must warn both sides not to expect us to press for a complete transformation at once. It will take some years to bring up the non-provided schools to the general level of the provided ones, especially in the matter of building (which will be paid for by the trustees, not by the ratepayers); and in the meantime they must be carefully nursed into efficiency, and neither deprived of the benefit of the Act by coupling it with requirements they cannot possibly comply with at once, nor allowed to slacken in their diligence by receiving large sums of public money without any conditions at all.

#### THE BOARD SCHOOLS

As to the Board Schools, or the Provided Schools, as they will be called in the future, we have not been asked for any assurances, perhaps because they are not supposed to be threatened by the new Act. Now this is a most dangerous mistake. The great power for good which the new Act puts into the hands of wise and tolerant Educationists, is, like all real powers, a power for evil as well as for good. Let no one for a moment dream that the hostility to the Church Schools avowed by some extreme Free Churchmen has not its counterpart in the hostility of some extreme Established Churchmen to the Board Schools. The next London County Council will have just the same power to starve, wreck and degrade the Board Schools of London as to refuse to come to the rescue of the Church Schools. Not only the same power, but the same excuse — Conscience! May we remind you in all earnestness that there is nothing more dangerous than the conscience of a bigot or more trustworthy in this matter than the conscience of men who can respect the beliefs of others as they respect their own? A passionate Anglican majority on the next Council would be just as dangerous as a majority of passionate Passive Resisters. It could make war on "Board School religion," impose religious tests on teachers by tacitly refusing to appoint or promote "heretics" or "dissenters," and refuse to establish unsectarian Training Colleges. It could also lavish your money on Church Schools without exacting any better educational services from them than they render at present. In short, if an intolerant and bigoted majority be returned, it matters little which side that majority is on: the mischief will be equally great, whether it be wrought by the zeal of an anti-Board School party or an anti-Church School party.

#### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The danger to our Roman Catholic and Jewish citizens of a majority of extremists is too plain to need emphasizing. The extremists of the Free Churches hold Rome in open abhorrence. The extremists of the Established Church regard themselves as Anglican Catholics; and their high political idealism and patriotism, which we should all be careful not to undervalue or misunderstand, makes them the strongest opponents of



the government of the English Catholic Church by Italians. And they will always remain so, because those Anglicans who are lukewarm on this point join the Roman Catholic Church and are lost to Anglican Catholicism. The notion that the Anglicans are the allies and friends of the Roman Catholics on political questions is entertained only by those who are too strongly prejudiced against both sections to understand them.

#### THE JEWISH SCHOOLS

As to the Jews, they are an example to us by the care they take of their children, and the intelligence with which they protect their public interests. But their interest in denominationalism in schools is bound up with their paramount interest in tolerance. A majority of sectarian extremists would be an anti-Jewish majority whether it was for or against the Act. What the Jewish citizen needs is a majority of tolerant educationists who accept the Act and will make the best of it. That is our position. We do not suppose many votes will turn on it in St. Pancras; but the right of the Jews to know our opinion does not depend on the number of them on the register.

#### IS THE EDUCATION ACT GOING TO BE REPEALED?

We find that many Liberal electors who dislike the Education Act believe that it will presently vanish by an Act of Repeal passed by a Liberal Government. We entreat them not to ask us to proceed on such a very improbable supposition. It is, of course, likely enough that if Mr. Chamberlain's campaign fails, a dissolution next Easter (say) may be followed by a return of the Liberals to power. But is it likely that the Liberal majority will be large enough to be independent of the Irish party, which is solid for denominational education? Even if that happened, would repeal be any nearer? Those who advocate it forget that the Act establishes public secondary education in this country for the first time, and that it gives power to establish unsectarian Training Colleges. The Passive Resisters themselves would be the first to oppose any attempt to undo these two reforms. What is demanded is the amendment of the Act; and this is certain to come after some practical experience of its working, no matter which party is in power. The only question that will divide the parties will be as between maintaining the compromise made with the Church by the Act, and abolishing the foundation managers, which would involve the acquirement of the denominational school buildings as national property at considerable cost to the ratepayers. This is a very different matter from the total repeal of the Act. The truth is, the demand for repeal is not a London demand. It comes from Wales, and from certain country districts where the Church is dominant and intolerant. Now London is not a country district, and is not Wales. Mr. Lloyd George's ideas no more apply to South St. Pancras than the London Building Act to the Welsh hills. In London, the Free Churchmen, accustomed for thirty-five years to a Board School system working under a compact of tolerance embodied in the Compromise know nothing of the bitterness of the country folk who have been forced to go to village Church Schools, and been sometimes told there by clergymen that all "Dissenters" will be lost eternally. And it is this bitterness that has blinded a certain number of earnest Free Churchmen to the fact that the clauses they dislike are not the whole Act, but only a small portion of it.

Further, the country County Councils are very different from the London County Council. The country Councils are unpopular among Free Churchmen, who regard them as High Tory, High Church bodies, not to be trusted in educational matters. But the London County Council is a Progressive body which is supported as enthusiastically by Lib-

erals and Free Churchmen as by the Unionists and Established Churchmen without whose votes its majority would be swept away. In fifteen years it has changed London from one of the worst governed cities in the kingdom to one of the best. Its Technical Education Board has served as the model for the new Education Authorities set up by the new Acts. It has converted the old grudging endowment of a few mechanical workshops and science schools under the head of "Technical Education," into a magnificent public conquest, confirmed by the new Act, of the whole range of secondary education, right up to the London University. It has done this without incurring the slightest suspicion of being under any sort of clerical or sectarian influence. In the meantime the London School Board has been rent with sectarian dissensions. For a time, until its bigotry became intolerable to the electors, it was everything that the countrybred Free Churchman most detests, whilst the Technical Education Board remained everything that he most desires.

Under these circumstances may we not conclude that the man who believes that the Free Churchmen of London will unite in pressing the next Liberal Government to abolish the new County Council authority, and give them back the old School Board again, so that Mr. Diggle and Mr. Athelstan Riley may have another chance, is either a man whose ideas have been formed in Wales and the rural counties, or a man who has read the party newspapers with more attention than the Education Act. And when it is considered that the repeal of the Act would raise the school rate by depriving London of grants amounting to over £500 a day, and disendow secondary and technical education at the very moment when the Liberal leaders are putting it forward as the true remedy for the evils at which Mr. Chamberlain's tariff is aimed, we can hardly be accused of exaggeration if we dismiss the expectation of repeal as outside the pale of reasonable politics.

#### THE POLICY OF DELAY

Those who have read so far will realise that delay is useless. Delay only means waiting for repeal; and if repeal is out of the question there is no sense in delay. The Act must be taken in hand at once; and Parliament will give it some years' trial at least before a new experiment will be suggested, no matter what party comes into power. For ourselves personally, we must say emphatically that as every day's delay will cost London £500 (and more), we shall, if elected, strenuously oppose all attempts at postponement, whether for twenty-four hours or twelve months.

#### THE FREE CHURCH LEADERS

We are well aware that in taking this position we shall surprise and displease many electors whose notions of the London Education Act are derived, not, like ours, from the Act itself, and from practical experience of public work, but from the party warfare of the newspapers. It is an open secret that the Progressive party on the present Council was with difficulty brought by its coolest and ablest leaders to see what an enormous power for good the Act had placed in their hands. We are all the more indebted to the Free Church leaders in South Pancras, who, whilst prepared to sacrifice themselves personally in opposition to clauses in the Act which they cannot accept even provisionally, have agreed not to divide the choice of the electors as between us and the anti-Progressive candidates.

#### THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

As to the members of the Established Church, they will hardly quarrel with us for defending their schools against the extreme Passive

Resistance party and defending the Act against London newspapers which influence many Progressive votes. Still, we are quite aware that if nothing but the Education Act were at stake in this election, we should have no greater claim on electors who desire denominational education than the anti-Progressive candidates. Indeed we should not oppose them had not the past elections shown that many of our Established Churchmen, Roman Catholics, and Jews are convinced Progressives. Now nothing could be harder on these ladies and gentlemen than to be forced to vote for the declared enemies of the London County Council lest their schools should suffer. In our case they have nothing to fear. If we are returned we shall in all probability find our party in a majority; for even the most sanguine Moderate can hardly, after the result of the Borough Council Elections, feel assured that the Progressives will lose as many as 29 seats — and less than that will not place them in a minority. Now if the anti-Progressive members remain in a minority, their championship of denominational education will be of no avail: it will only strengthen the hands of the extreme section of the Progressive majority, and weaken the reasonable and tolerant section to which we belong. On the other hand, the tolerant Progressives will speak and vote as members of the majority, and supporters of the official Progressive policy. We, as tolerant Progressives, are therefore confident that we shall have the support of all the Established Churchmen, Roman Catholics, and Jews, who are anxious to secure justice for their schools. If, in addition, we also represent the lay views of the denominationalist electors, we need fear no opposition except from the anti-County Council politicians, whom we could conciliate only by pledging myself to a course of municipal wrecking, which is, of course, out of the question.

We therefore pass on to secular matters. Every elector has the same interest in these; and many object to the obscuring of business issues at the election by sectarian controversy.

#### OUR MUNICIPAL PROGRAMME

Our municipal programme is simple enough in principle. We approach such a question as Municipal Trading, for instance, simply as ratepayers and men of business. The central business fact of the situation is that the London County Council can raise capital at less than four per cent, whereas the ratepayer, as a private man, borrowing on his own security has to pay from six to twenty-five per cent. The poorer he is, the more he pays. Consequently, whenever he has to pay for the use of capital, whether for the supply of electric light, gas, water, trams, or other necessities of city life, he had better let the Council raise it for him on its public credit than attempt to raise it for himself on his own private credit. Before the County Council was founded in 1888 he had to compromise by going to joint stock companies; but these companies could not raise capital at 3½ per cent: they had to promise as much more as they could squeeze out of their customers.

Now with us, the whole question is one of business. You require certain services of the kind mentioned above. Our first question is, can the Council do it for you more cheaply than you can do it for yourself? Our second is, can the Council do it for you more cheaply than a company can do it? If the answer is yes to both questions, then all the complaints of "municipal trading" in the financial papers will not prevent us from urging the Council to undertake the service and thus reduce the cost of living for you. If the answer is no, then we shall vote against County Council interference in spite of all attempts to make "municipalisation" a universal cut and dried principle. For instance, we shall not want to set up a municipal optical factory because the Chief Engineer wants a theodolite, nor a musical instrument factory because the park



bands want some trombones. But if every ratepayer in St. Pancras used up half a dozen theodolites and trombones every day just as he uses so many feet of gas or gallons of water, then we should change our minds. We repeat, it is a matter of common sense and business capacity. There is no danger of injuring private trade, because the more active the Council is, the more trade it makes for the firms who supply it with materials, and the more employment it gives to their workmen and its own.

#### ECONOMY

We need not say that we are in favour of economy. We have never heard of candidates who were not. But when you are dealing with a body like the County Council, with revenue of three millions a year, and with a city like London, you must know how to spend money as well as save it. The timid penny-wise pound-foolish councillor who votes against every item of expenditure, is the most extravagant of all public representatives. We have a startling illustration of this in St. Pancras and Marylebone today. Years ago both these boroughs had the chance of starting their own electric lighting works. Marylebone was horrified at such "extravagance," such "reckless municipal trading," such a mad "accumulation of municipal debt." It left the work to a joint stock company. St. Pancras kept its head, got an Electric Lighting Order, borrowed the necessary capital, and established its Electric Lighting Works, on the committee of which one of us has served for some years past.

Now mark the result. The St. Pancras Electric Lighting enterprise has never cost the ratepayers one farthing from first to last. It has, on the contrary, contributed again and again to the general rate; and it supplies light and power as cheaply as any private company in London. And this, remember, in addition to paying off its debt by a sinking fund which will soon make the whole concern the absolute unencumbered property of the ratepayers. That is what we mean by economy; and we know that such economy can only be attained by prudent expenditure, never by timid saving and by calling your capital "debt." Meanwhile, what has happened to Marylebone? Marylebone, having left to a private company the work it should have done itself, has had to buy that company out for a million and a quarter, which sum the ratepayers will now have to find. All this was brought about in the name of economy. We call it timid extravagance. Yet the electric lighting business is so safe that the companies are competing with one another for the chance of taking over Marylebone's bad bargain.

#### THE RATES

Here we come to the sorest point in the whole municipal question. It is true that Progressive municipal enterprise does not raise the rates: on the contrary, as we have just seen in the case of the St. Pancras Electric Lighting, it relieves them. The lighting profits have just knocked a penny in the pound off the St. Pancras general rate. It is also true that a vigorous County Council, spending money freely on public health, convenience, and safety, saves the ratepayer more than it costs him. It is better to pay a shilling more to the rate collector than a couple of pounds more to the doctor. The delay caused by the block at the Euston Road end of the Hampstead Road causes an enormous loss of time every year (not to mention the accidents); and, to men of business, time is money. Whilst the policeman is holding up the traffic, the horses are "eating their heads off," the vehicles being worn out by the unnecessary stopping and starting, the men losing their time and their tempers. The electors may reply that this may be very

important for the great shopkeepers of Tottenham Court and Hampstead Roads, with their caravans of delivery carts, but that it does not concern people who have no carts and who are paid the same for their time whether they are delayed or not. But this is a great mistake. We all have to buy from the shopkeepers; and whatever increases the cost of delivery raises the price of the goods. When street improvements enable all our big providers, our Maples, Shoolbreds, and Catesbys, to make seven carts, horses, and carmen do the work that now takes ten, hundreds of articles, from piano to cork lino, will become cheaper. In short, paying rates is just like paying anything else: a very good thing when you get value for it and a very bad thing when you do not. If we ever have to choose between charging you a penny to save you a halfpenny and charging you a shilling to save you a half-a-crown, we shall charge you the shilling.

#### RELIEF FOR THE STRUGGLING RATEPAYER

But when all is said, the fact remains that many of us are too poor to live economically. It is easy to tell a very poor woman that it is cheaper to buy tea by the pound than by the farthingsworth; but if she has only a farthing in her pocket she must either buy her tea in the dearest way or go without. In the same way it is easy to come to a man who is struggling along in a small business, handicapped by want of capital and heavy household expenses, and raise the cry of "high rates and a healthy city." He may reply quite truly, "I know it; but I can't afford high rates; and I can't afford to live in a healthy city. I know it would be prudent and thrifty of me to insure my life; but I can't afford the premium. I know lots of economical, far-sighted, sensible things that I could do if I were Pierpont Morgan or Carnegie; but, as it is, I can't do them because I haven't got the money. And if you put up the rates on me you may do all sorts of splendid things for the benefit of London and the Empire; but you'll begin by ruining me."

Now the Napoleonic reply to this is well known. "You can't make omelettes without breaking eggs." But that is not our reply. We know that though, under a capable Council, the rates are a paying investment for the ratepayer, yet no man can or ought to put money into investments until he has first spent enough on himself and his family to keep them well nourished and respectable. We frankly think that just as no man has to pay any Income Tax until he is making £160 a year, or to pay in full until he is making £700, so no man ought to have to pay rates until he can do so without unduly impoverishing himself. At present the rates are not only heavy, but they are assessed on a wrong principle. Nothing can be more unfair than to levy full rates on a shopkeeper when the costermonger outside his door—who is sometimes a richer man—pays nothing. Nor is the rating fair as between one man of business and another; because one man may make very high profits in a very small shop or office whilst another may make very small ones in a business which takes up a great deal of room and consequently pays much more in rates. Again—and this is an instance that concerns many householders in South St. Pancras—there is all the difference in the world between the prosperous citizen who pays £100 or £150 a year for a private house, and the lodging-house keeper who pays the same rent, but can hardly make both ends meet by letting all the rooms. In short, the value of the premises occupied is not a fair measure of the "rateable capacity" of the tenant.

#### TAXATION OF GROUND VALUES

Then there is the eternal question of the worker and the idler. We are ourselves owners of property, and therefore not likely to be indifferent to the interests of property; but we sympathise entirely with

the growing claim that those ratepayers who work, whether as men of business or professional men, should contribute less than those who simply live on the rents earned by the activity of our shopkeepers and householders. The ground values of London must by this time amount to nearly twenty millions a year; and the interest paid out of London businesses on capital that has been lent out of ground rents and not out of fair earnings, is incalculable — it is certainly not less than another twenty millions. All this ground rent and interest on unearned capital saved out of ground values is recognised by Parliament as a proper subject for taxation by special schedules of the Income Tax, heavy death duties, and the like. We venture to say that it is quite as proper a subject for special local rating; and we shall advocate not merely the election cry of "Taxation of Ground Values," but the complete exemption from rating of our really poor householders and shopkeepers, the partial exemption of those a little better off, and the heaviest possible rating in those cases, few but flagrant where monopolists who do no productive work at all enjoy incomes amounting sometimes to much more than a thousand pounds a day. Considering that every pound we spend on our houses and shops, and every addition we make by our energy to the goodwill of our businesses, falls in the long run — or the short run; for long leases are things of the past in St. Pancras — to the owner of the ground, it is not too much to ask that as long as London belongs to the ground landlords they shall pay for keeping it in order.

#### FALSE ECONOMY

In the meantime, however, we must earnestly urge the ratepayers not to be misled by mistaken attempts at economy. We are not likely to forget what false economy means in St. Pancras. For the last ten years the most prudent members of the St. Pancras Vestry (now the Borough Council) asked steadily, half-year after half-year, for an additional halfpenny on the general rate. The ratepayers were very angry with them, and shewed it by voting for the Moderates, who triumphantly resisted the extra halfpenny. What was the result? The Vestry could not pay its way, and sank deeper and deeper into debt by over-drawing its bank account. And this was during years of good trade, when the extra halfpenny would have been only lightly felt. At last, when the Borough Council succeeded the Vestry, and the Local Government Board auditor came along for the first time, he found an illegal debt of £70,000 against the Vestry. He demanded the instant repayment, which would have meant a rise in the rate of one and sixpence in the pound. It was with great difficulty that the so-called "economists" induced him to allow a few years of the repayment. Even as it was, the rate jumped up by sixpence in the pound at once; and the result was that the "ratepayers' candidates" were swept from power at the late Borough Council election. And it served them right, though we regret to have to add that the wards in South St. Pancras refused to share in the general disapproval, and clung to the representatives who had plunged them into debt. Now the sort of economy which consists in refusing to look your liabilities in the face, and dragging the ratepayer into debt in order to coax his vote from him, is one with which we will have nothing to do. We shall keep the figures as low as possible; but we shall keep them honest.

#### FAIR WAGES AND THE POOR RATE

There is one other financial imposture which will not impose on us. Have you ever realised the fact that even with the equalisation of rates, the sum you have to pay for Poor Rate is greater than the County Council rate, greater than the School rate, and much greater (nearly four times) than the Police? Every year London poverty costs St.

Pancras about £150,000, and you get nothing back for it. Have you considered what that means?

Suppose there is a big piece of public work to be done. Suppose it is the sort of work the Council cannot economically undertake itself, and one contractor offers to do it for £11,000 and another for £10,000. Would it pay the ratepayer to accept the lowest tender? At first sight it seems as if there could be no doubt that the lower tender would save the ratepayers £1,000.

Well, you will not catch us taking that for granted quite so easily. Not that we are any fonder of the higher tender than other people! The secret of the cheapness of the lowest tender might be more experience in business, quicker and more skillful workmen, up-to-date machinery, and capable superintendence. In that case we should accept it. But suppose the real secret of the cheapness were the sweating of the labor employed — scamped work, cheap materials, above all, cheap men, casual labourers, second rate engineers and surveyors, shady accountants. In such cases, the fact that the work is badly done, and will soon need repairing or redoing, is only a trifle in the expense. The real burden to the ratepayer is the sweated labourer. The contractor picks him up in the street, pays him a wretched wage, screws what he can out of him, discharges him, and is done with him. But the ratepayers are never done with him. They have to find a casual ward for him; they have to find a workhouse for him when he is worn out at fifty; they have to find an infirmary for him when he is ill, a prison for him when he is driven to steal. Metropolitan policemen to keep him at a cost to St. Pancras alone of £35,000 a year, schools for his children (say £100,000 a year); and it is because the ratepayer pays all this for him that the contractor is able to pick him up for less than a living wage. Is it not plain that in this case the contractor is sweating the ratepayer as well as the labourer? The thousand pounds that the ratepayer saves by accepting the lowest tender may crop up again as £2,000, or £20,000, in the Poor Rate he has to pay.

Now this is the whole secret of the true economy of "fair wages" in County Council employment and County Council contracts. It is not a question of charity, or of giving the labourer an unfair privilege in exchange for his vote. It is a solid matter of business, in which the Council insists on the contractor paying the full living wage of the labourer he contracts to supply, and not throwing half the cost of it back on the Poor Rate. A contractor who makes paupers would be dear if he did the work for nothing. A contractor who pays a living wage costs no more than the agreed sum. That is why we shall, if elected, make the payment of a living wage the first condition of accepting a contract, and why we shall uphold it for Council's own employees. We do not want to pull down either wages or profits: we do not [*sic*]<sup>1</sup> want to pull down the Poor Rate.

#### THE TRAMWAYS.

We have a special word to say on this subject, because one of the main county routes from London to the north passes through Tottenham Court Road; and a large firm in that great thoroughfare has placed itself at the head of an agitation to force the County Council to leave the road out of the complete system of electric tramways which it is planning. We have no doubt that the firm in question is a sincerely convinced that a tramway to its doors is an evil as were the the equally respectable and eminent country lords of the manor who refused fifty years ago to allow the railroads to pass through the towns and villages on their land. The result was that the towns which were saved from the railroad de-

<sup>1</sup> Not may be a typographical error, as it reverses the obvious sense of the statement by its presence.

cayed. Their very names passed away, with their business, to the new towns which sprang up round the banished railway station. We are not going to make that mistake with regard to Tottenham Court Road. The diversion of the tramway might not ruin the great firms which have frontages on the alternative routes, and property or premises, now used as hostels for their assistants, to which their business might be transferred if the tram abandoned the Road and trade followed the tram. But the vast majority of Tottenham Court Road shopkeepers would be left stranded. We speak with confidence, because our knowledge of the subject is not confined to London. Nobody who has ever spent a week in Dublin or Glasgow will give a moment's attention to the old-fashioned nonsense which has been rife in St. Pancras on the tramway question for some years past. And we, who have seen the most famous thoroughfares throughout Europe, with their palatial shops and magnificent hotels, served by double and sometimes quadruple lines of brilliantly-lighted electric trams, look forward to the time when Tottenham Court Road, duly widened and with its western side largely reconstructed, will take its place among the famous streets of Europe. Until then, the immense comfort, cheapness and convenience of the Council's electric tramway system in South London, will be drawing tenants, lodgers, customers, and business across the river, and injuring South St. Pancras both as a residential and business quarter. In the face of all this, we cannot believe that the more intelligent and capable of our Tottenham Court Road men of business will allow themselves to be persuaded by a few of their own keenest and most powerful competitors to vote for the present crowd of buses, with all the insanitary consequences of multiplying horses on a wooden pavement. In any case, we can make no concessions to the anti-tram movement. We regard an electric tramway as a valuable asset to a neighborhood; and we shall not change our opinion until somebody shows us the fabled streets where the shopkeepers have been ruined, the valuations reduced, and the population driven away by the establishment of cheap, speedy and comfortable communication with the suburbs and the center. At present we do not believe that such places exist.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, may we ask you to consider this long pamphlet as something more than an ordinary election address. We do not believe that either we ourselves or the Progressive party have a monopoly of honourable intention, public spirit, and political capacity; and we offer these pages to voters of all parties as a help to the understanding of the main questions at issue in the election — questions which are practically never handled by the newspapers without a strong party bias. We do not ask you to vote for us: you must vote according to your judgment; but we do earnestly beg you not to leave your vote unused. If no more votes are counted this time than three years ago, the successful candidates will represent only a minority of the ratepayers; and upwards of 3,000 votes will be wasted. Later on we shall send you clear instructions as to what to do when you go to the polling station, so that if you have never voted before, you will know exactly what to do. Voting is as easy as buying postage stamps, and costs nothing.

We need hardly add that if we are returned, we shall consider ourselves charged with the interests of the whole constituency, and not merely with those of our supporters at the poll.

We hope to become,  
Your obedient servants in Council,  
WILLIAM NEVILL M. GEARY,  
G. BERNARD SHAW.

*Feb. 1904.*



# A Continuing Check-list of Shaviana

compiled and edited by Charles A. Carpenter, Jr.<sup>1</sup>

## I. Works by Shaw

- The Adventures of the Black Girl in Her Search for God*, with the original illustrations by John Farleigh. New York: Putnam, 1959; New York: Capricorn Books, 1959. Hardbound and paperback reprints of Shaw's iconoclastic tale about an unindoctrinated black girl's search for the true God among the several existing versions. First published in 1933.
- Bernard Shaw: a Prose Anthology*; selected, with introduction and notes, by H. M. Burton. Preface by A. C. Ward. London: Longmans in association with Constable, 1959. Apparently intended for secondary school use.
- Cashel Byron Beruf*, translated into German by Alfred Brieger. Berlin: Rutten & Loening, 1958.
- The Crime of Imprisonment*. Michigan City, Indiana: Fridtjof-Karla Publications, 1959. Hardbound and paperback reprints of an essay (84 pages) which, entitled "Imprisonment," was originally a preface to Lord Olivier's report on prison conditions, later the preface to Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *English Prisons Under Local Government*, in 1946 separately published in New York as *The Crime of Imprisonment*.
- Harris, Frank, *Oscar Wilde; Including My Memories of Oscar Wilde*, by George Bernard Shaw; with an introductory note by Lyle Blair. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959. Reprint of a lively but unreliable and highly controversial book first published in 1916 as *Oscar Wilde; His Life and Confessions*.
- Kalmar, Jack, "Shaw on Art," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 147-59. Kalmar concisely summarizes the main facets of Shaw's art criticism, then reprints four articles from *The World* (1886-89) which illustrate these points.
- Kuensterliebe*, translated into German by Wilhelm Cremer and Alfred Brieger. Guetersloh: Bertelsmann Lesering, 1958. (*Love Among the Artists*.)
- Letter, in Ernest Dudley, *The Gilded Lily* (Long Acre, London: Odhams Press, 1958), 178. Brief excerpt from a Shaw letter to Lillie Langtry.
- "*Un Petit Drame*; Bernard Shaw's First and Hitherto Unpublished Play," *Esquire*, LII (December, 1959), 172-74. Includes the original French text, a translation by Norman Denny, and a note by Stanley Weintraub. From the note: "Its autobiographical interest outweighs its questionable literary value."
- Pygmalion*, translated into German by Siegfried Trebitsch. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1958. Probably not more than a reprint.
- Selected Works of Bernard Shaw*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958. Printed as an English text for Russians. Includes seven plays and selections from Shaw's criticism, all in English, and an introduction and notes in Russian.
- Shaw on Theatre*, ed. by E. J. West. New York: Hill and Wang "Dramabooks," 1959. A paperback reprint, with bibliographical corrections by Dan Laurence, of the volume published in 1958.
- Die Toerichte Heirat*, translated by Wilhelm Cremer and Alfred Brieger. Berlin: Rutten & Loening, 1958. (*The Irrational Knot*.)

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Carpenter, *Shaw Review Bibliographer*, is on leave during the current academic year from his post as Librarian at the Goldwin Smith Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Readers, writers and publishers are urged to call contemporary Shaviana to the Bibliographer's attention.

## II. Shaviana — Books and Pamphlets

- Barnes, Sir Kenneth Ralph, *Welcome Good Friends; the Autobiography of Kenneth Barnes*, ed. by Phyllis Hartnoll (London: Davies, 1958), 161-75 and *passim*. Partially documented recollections of Shaw's relations with the Academy of Dramatic Art (1912-42), including letters, reports, and recorded conversations.
- Bright, Mary Chevalita Dunne, *A Leaf from The Yellow Book: the Correspondance of George Egerton*, ed. by Terence de Vere White (London: Richards Press, 1958), 64-67, 101-02, 144-47. Includes two letters from Shaw about "George Egerton" (Mrs. Golding Bright), and her equally low opinion of him.
- Brome, Vincent, *Frank Harris* (London: Cassell, 1959), *passim*. Frequently refers to Shaw's relations with Harris, and cites a few unpublished letters.
- Carrington, Norman Thomas, *G. Bernard Shaw: Saint Joan (Excluding the Preface)*. Rev. ed. London: Brodie, 1958. Another in the series of pamphlets, "Notes on Chosen English Texts," edited by Carrington; previous edition 1950. 53 pages.
- Collis, John Stewart, *Havelock Ellis: Artist of Life; a Study of His Life and Work* (New York: Sloane, 1959), 203-05 and *passim*. Ellis on what he takes to be Shaw's Superman.
- Ellmann, Richard, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), *passim*. Shaw's reactions to Joyce's *Exiles* and *Ulysses*, and other documented material.
- Gibbon, Monk, *The Masterpiece and the Man: Yeats as I Knew Him* (London: Hart-Davis, 1959), 160 and *passim*. Includes a letter from Shaw and Yeats (1932) sent to prominent literary Irishmen, advocating the organization of an Irish Academy of *Belles Lettres*.
- Hassall, Christopher, *Edward Marsh, Patron of the Arts; a Biography* (London: Longmans, 1959), 152, 245, 581-82. Marsh opposed Shaw's opinions on pronunciation and poetry. A sample of Shaw's debating strategy is recorded. Simultaneously published in New York by Harcourt, Brace.
- Heffner, Hubert C., Samuel Selden, and Hunton D. Sellman, *Modern Theatre Practice* (4th ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), 161-67. Sh: sophisticated thesis comedy depends to a great extent upon "a certain shockingness" of its ideas to gain its effects. *Man and Superman* is treated as an example.
- Hewitt, Barnard, *Theatre U. S. A., 1668 to 1957* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), 291-93, 317-19. Includes excerpts from reviews of early American productions of *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and *Androcles and the Lion*.
- Hovey, Richard B., *John Jay Chapman, an American Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 194-96. A documented account of Chapman's reactions to Shaw (negative).
- Howard, Leslie Ruth, *A Quite Remarkable Father* (New York: Harcourt, 1959), 246-52. Memories of the Pascal filming of *Pygmalion* by the daughter of Leslie Howard, who played Higgins.
- Hudson, Derek, ed., *English Critical Essays: Twentieth Century; Second Series* ("World's Classics"; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958). Reprints Walter Allen's centenary article on Shaw, which first appeared anonymously in the *Times Literary Supplement*, July 27, 1956.
- Joseph, Bertram, *The Tragic Actor* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), 365-67, 387-89. Shaw's comments on Irving and Forbes-Robertson as actors, in a context of general evaluations.
- McCarthy, Mary, *Sights and Spectacles, 1937-1958* (London: Heinemann, 1959), 37-42, 149-60, 193-96. Reviews of *Heartbreak House* (1938 production) and *The Doctor's Dilemma* (1955), plus a brief comparison of Shaw and John Osborne.

- McDermott, William F., *The Best of McDermott; Selected Writings* (Cleveland: World, 1959), 18-22, 67-69. Two pieces written for the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* in 1922 and 1957: "Bernard Shaw," an interview, and "Shavian Self-Portraits," a favorable estimate of the prefaces.
- McKay, George L., comp., *A Stevenson Library: Catalogue of a Collection of Writings by and about Robert Louis Stevenson Formed by Edwin J. Beinecke* (4 vols.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951-58), *passim*. References to a letter from William Morris to Shaw, from Andrew Lang to Mrs. Stevenson (about *Cashel Byron's Profession*), and from William E. Henley to Stevenson ("Who the devil is Bernard Shaw? . . . He feels like a new force in fiction").
- Newman, Ernest, "Mr. Bernard Shaw as Musical Critic," in his *More Essays from the World of Music* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1958), 212-16.
- Nichols, Beverley, *The Sweet and Twenties* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1958), 59-65. Records one of Shaw's lesser contributions to drama, a few lines in *The Wild Oat* by Sydney Blow; and briefly debunks him as both dramatist and man.
- Nicoll, Allardyce, *A History of English Drama, 1660-1900*. Volume V: *Late Nineteenth Century Drama, 1850-1900* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959), *passim*, esp. 193-204. A hand-list of theatres and plays occupies pp. 215-850.
- Parker, Robert Allerton, *The Transatlantic Smiths* (New York: Random House, 1959), 64, 74. Memoirs of Shaw and his early associates in the Fabian Society (1884).
- Pollock, Sir John, *Curtain Up* (London: Davies, 1958), 71, 82-83, 140. Shaw mishandled "historical psychology," violated "unity of subject," and ignored "the requirements of his art."
- St. John, Christopher Marie, *Ethel Smyth; a Biography* (London: Longmans, 1959), 184-87, 278-79. Includes complete texts of two letters from Shaw to the composer-writer. But for her music, he wrote, "I might not have been able to tackle St. Joan."
- Sharpe, Robert Boies, *Irony in the Drama; an Essay on Impersonation, Shock, and Catharsis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 163-76 and *passim*. Sharpe somewhat cursorily examines the comic ironies in Shaw's plays, "all the way from the slightest and lightest of stylistic flicks . . . to deep social, even humane, considerations which approach tragedy and approach at the same time Shaw's own limitations." Shaw is "self-limited by a violent reaction against romanticism and idealism which had its roots in rejection as a child and in young-adult fighting against the adolescent reaction of romantic day-dreaming."
- Turner, Ethel, *The Child of the Children*. London: Ward, Lock, 1959. Reprint (31 pages) of a *Windsor Magazine* story (1897) by the Australian writer. Touted in an introductory note by James Wright, fiction editor for the publisher, as "the germ of *Pygmalion* . . ., the first 'Fair Lady'." Two letters to the editor of *The Times Literary Supplement*, Nov. 13, 1959, by Eric J. Batson and Stanley Weintraub, rebut the allegation, citing earlier (including Shavian) ancestry.
- Vancura, Zdenek, *Umeni G. B. Shawa*. Ceskoslovensky Spisovatel, 1958. "The Art of G. B. Shaw"; 206 pages.
- Zirkle, Conway, *Evolution, Marxian Biology and the Social Scene* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959). Zirkle claims that Shaw rejected every biological advance made in 75 years and "had to work hard and long to preserve his biological misinformation."



### III. Shaviana — Periodicals

- Alexander, Doris M., "Captain Brant and Captain Brassbound: the Origin of an O'Neill Character," *Modern Language Notes*, LXXIV (April, 1959), 306-10. The "Aegisthus" character of *Mourning Becomes Electra*, Brant is "an almost unaltered duplicate" of Shaw's hero in *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*.
- Block, Toni, "Shaw's Women," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 133-38. A lively, informal survey of the women in Shaw's life ("much stronger than the men") and in his plays (those he knew saying what they ought to have said).
- "The Boom in Shaw," *Tatler* (January 7, 1959), 21. Includes "Shaw on the Screen" by John Salt.
- Brecht, Bertolt, "Ovation for Shaw" (translated by Gerhard H. W. Zuther), *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 184-87. "I. Shaw's Terror: . . . The Shavian terror consists of Shaw's insistence on the prerogative of every man to act decently, logically, and with a sense of humor, and on the obligation to act in this manner even in the face of opposition. . . . II. Shaw Vindicated. . . : Shaw, in order to have a play, invents some complications which provide his characters with opportunities to vent their opinions extensively and to have them clash with ours. . . . III. Essential Contagiousness: Humor: . . . Shaw actually succeeds in giving the impression that his mental and bodily health increases with every sentence he writes."
- Cronin, Morton, "Cliches Are Pretty, Too," *National Review*, VII (June 20, 1959), 149-50. Cliches are generally denounced by authorities, but many of them occur in Emerson, Twain, and Shaw, who capitalize on their "established and relatively unmistakable" meanings.
- Dickie, Francis, "From Forest Fire to France," *American Book Collector*, IX (June, 1959), 22-25. Includes comments on Shaw and Oscar Wilde made by Frank Harris, recorded during an interview in 1927.
- Evans, Maurice, "Some Reminiscences of Shaw," *Theatre Arts*, XLIII (November, 1959), 17. Evans relates a few of Shaw's remarks on acting, playwriting, and *Man and Superman*.
- Farley, Earl, and Marvin Carlson, "George Bernard Shaw: a Selected Bibliography (1945-1955), Part One: Books," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 188-202. Over 300 references to books and parts of books by and about Shaw, listed with varying degrees of bibliographical consistency.
- Fehse, Willi, "Der Dolmetsch Bernard Shaws," *Welt-Stimmen* (Stuttgart), XXVII (1958), 182-83.
- Fisher, F. G., "Ibsen and His Background," *Anglo-Welsh Review*, X (January-June, 1959), 42-47. Largely a summary of Shaw's analysis of Ibsen's thought.
- Geduld, Harry M., "Back to Methuselah and the Birmingham Repertory Company," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 115-29. Details of the production and reception of the 1923 performance, drawn partly from unpublished sources and interviews.
- Gordan, John D., "New in the Berg Collection: 1957-1958: Part II," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXIII (April, 1959), 209-11. Briefly describes some of the letters, corrected proofs, and other autographed Shaviana acquired recently. Includes rehearsal copies of *The Shewing Up of Blanco Posnet* and *Androcles and the Lion*.
- Holroyd, Stuart, "Ambassador Extraordinary: the Ubiquity of Bernard Shaw," *Times Literary Supplement* (August 7, 1959), xxii-xxiii. A call to "reclaim" Shaw as the Jonathan Swift of his century. "If the letter of his writings often supports the Communist practice, their spirit militates against it."

- Hummert, Paul A., "Bernard Shaw's *On the Rocks*," *Drama Critique*, II (February, 1959), 34-41. The play and its Preface demonstrate the influence of Marxian philosophy on Shaw, the significance of which has been ignored by "Shawdolators."
- King, Carlyle, "G. B. S. on Literature: the Author as Critic," *Queen's Quarterly*, LXVI (Spring, 1959), 135-45. Shaw consistently proclaimed the What rather than the How in his literary criticism: style is necessary for the artist-philosopher but will emerge from his desire to say something about life as he experiences it in his own time and place.
- King, Walter N., "The Rhetoric of *Candida*," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 71-83. An analysis not of prose style but of the "verbal fabric" of *Candida*. The basic conflict is seen to be "between two rhetoricians, both of whom misunderstand the nature of [Candida], over whom they lock rhetorical horns, for the prime reason that neither understands himself or the rhetoric each holds in esteem." Marchbanks finally becomes "the Shavian realist."
- Laurence, Dan H., "Genesis of a Dramatic Critic," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 178-83. A synthesis of elusive Shaviana relating to his writing activities from the 1860s until his debut with the *Saturday Review*. Also printed in *The Shavian*, no. 16.
- McDowell, Frederick P. W., "The Eternal Against the Expedient': Structure and Theme in Shaw's *The Apple Cart*," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 99-113. *The Apple Cart* is mainly "an analysis of ideal personal distinction." Shaw's "searching inquiry into his theme provides not only the philosophic content of the play but its structural unity as well."
- McKee, Irving, "Bernard Shaw's Beginnings on the London Stage," *PMLA*, LXXIV (September, 1959), 470-81. A synthesis of source materials, many of them unpublished, relating mainly to *Arms and the Man*, *Candida*, and *The Devil's Disciple*.
- Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959). A special Shaw issue containing the ten separately listed articles and the following items: Ellen Pollock, "The Lightness in Shaw," 130-32; William Irvine, "Shaw and America," 160-61; Stanley Weintraub, "The Metamorphoses of *The Shaw Review*," 162-63; Eldon C. Hill, "Shaw's 'Biographer-in-Chief,'" 164-72; and Archibald Henderson, "Shaw and America: the End of a Century," 173-77.
- Musulin, Stella, "Der Freidenker und die Nonne," *Wort und Wahrheit*, XIII (1958), 398-400.
- Mycroft, Walter, "Shaw—and the Devil to Pay," *Films and Filming*, (February, 1959).
- Nethercot, Arthur H., "Bernard Shaw, Ladies and Gentlemen," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 84-98. "Ladies and gentlemen" in Shaw's plays adhere to the externals of a standardized code of conduct, but often contradict it by their actions. Shaw's attitude toward them is consistently one of "amused scorn."
- Offenberg, Maria, "Die Aebtissin Laurentia : t G. B. Shaw," *Die christliche Frau*, XLVII (1958), 71-75.
- Rankin, H. D., "Plato and Bernard Shaw: The ideal Communities," *Hermathena* (Trinity College, Dublin), XCIII (May, 1959), 71-77. Compares the *Republic* and *Back to Methuselah* (particularly "As Far as Thought Can Reach"). The correspondence between Plato's Guardians and Shaw's Ancients is striking.
- The Regional*, II (nos. 2, 3: March, August, 1959). Issued by The New York Regional Group of The Shaw Society (London) No. 2 includes "Enter George Bernard Shaw" by Harcourt Williams (reprinted from The Vic-Wells Association's magazine, July, 1956), and other material. No. 3 includes

Shaw's "Shutting up an Individualist," a satire signed "Redbarn Wash" (reprinted from *To-Day* [London], n. s. VII, April, 1887); "Shelley, Shaw and the Vegetable Kingdom" by Morita-Leah Frederick; "Mozart, Masons and Methuselah" by Harry M. Geduld (one of the more subtle Mozartian elements in *BM*); and news notes.

Reichart, Walter A., "Gerhart Hauptmann, War Propaganda, and George Bernard Shaw," *Germanic Review*, XXXIII (October, 1958), 176-80. Shaw's opinion of war atrocities is compared incidentally with Hauptmann's. Bibliographical notes are useful.

Sharp, William, "Getting Married: New Dramaturgy in Comedy," *Educational Theatre Journal*, XI (May, 1959), 103-09. *Getting Married*, unlike dramas organized around plot or character, is ordered around thought. The play has five actions, each of which focuses on a different difficulty in divorce laws. Thus, the play can best be described as a debate, the outcome of which affects all characters.

*The Shavian*, nos. 14-16 (February, June, October, 1959). The journal of The Shaw Society (London). No. 14 includes "Shakes o Shaw" by Roy Walker (Renaissance humanism vs. Puritan "purification"); "A Night to Remember" by Allan M. Laing (Shaw and Arthur Conan Doyle on the Titanic disaster); "Two Fallen Women: Paula Tanqueray and Kitty Warren" by Martin L. Kornbluth (Paula repents, but with Kitty "purification is uncalled for"); etc. No. 15 includes "Return of Ulysses" by "a correspondent," reprinted from the *Times Educational Supplement*, September 12, 1958 (a critic's conversion from con- to pro-Shaw); "The Vivie-Frank Relationship in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*" by Arthur H. Nethercot (Shaw dramatizes the *theoretical* much more than *actual* possibility that they may be blood relations); "Shaw and Strindberg" by Colin Wilson (one is detached from, the other personally involved in his works); summaries of talks on Shaw, news notes, and a "Literary Survey." No. 16 includes "The Dangers of a 'Sun Trap'; Bernard Shaw's Warning to South Africa," a transcription of a broadcast Shaw made in 1932; "G. B. S.: British Fascist?" by Richard Nickson (Salvemini vs. Shaw on Mussolini); "Genesis of a Dramatic Critic" (see Laurence, above).

Shrive, Norman, "Granville-Barker and Edwardian Theatre," *Waterloo Review*, I (Winter, 1959); 34-46. Barker's major achievement remains his innovations in drama and theatre, influenced by Shaw, rather than his Shakespearean criticism—also influenced by Shaw.

Smoker, Barbara, "G B S and the A B C," *Modern Drama*, II (September, 1959), 139-46. Combats popular fallacies about Shaw and phonetics; he was an enthusiastic amateur in the field, but an intelligent one.

Weintraub, Stanley, "The Embryo Playwright in Bernard Shaw's Early Novels," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, I (Autumn, 1959), 327-55. Shaw—consciously and unconsciously—pillaged his own prentice novels in creating his plays, from *Widowers' Houses* to *Farfetched Fables*.

#### IV. Shaviana — Dissertations

Since these items are not examined by the bibliographer, reference is given to the abstracts found in Dissertation Abstracts (DA).

Spector, Samuel Hardy, "The Social and Educational Philosophy of George Bernard Shaw," DA, XVIII (June, 1958), 2169-70 (Wayne University).

## Reviews.

### Heartbreak House Revived

One of the producers of *Heartbreak House*, now playing at the Billy Rose Theatre, is Robert L. Joseph. In a recent news article Mr. Joseph said he decided to produce the play after it appeared on five lists of favorite plays chosen by ten famous theatre people last year. That is not a strong enough reason to produce a play as symbolic and involved as *Heartbreak House*. The players he has gathered, Maurice Evans, Diana Wynyard, Pamela Brown, Sam Levene, Diane Cilento and Alan Webb, perform with stylish brilliance and the director, Harold Clurman, has kept the show moving at a rapid pace. We see a bright comedy that might have been written by Maugham or even Coward, and we admire the pyrotechnics of the individual actors, but the sky rockets are all aimed in different directions. The target should be Shaw's intention in writing the play, but there is no target, and certainly no bull's eye. We see a high class performance by a high class stock company in which each actor plays his "line" and knows his lines, but doesn't seem to know the play.

The best scene in the performance but not necessarily of the play is the long one in Act II between Captain Shotover and Ellie. Maurice Evans and Diane Cilento play it quietly, and show with accurate touches, the development of a clear understanding and a close relationship between two people. The growth here is organic and dynamic, not artificial and imposed as it seems to be in so many of the other scenes. Sorrell Booke as the Burglar plays his scene exactly right, but the character loses his significance because he seems to have no effect on the other characters. Sam Levene plays himself disarmingly with a fascinating kind of detachment. And no wonder, because Mr. Levene is not Boss Mangan and the character we see is of course out of place in this house and in this play. When Mr. Levene's heart is breaking he cries petulantly and the audience laughs happily, but when Mangan cries, the audience and Hesione should be uncomfortable and shaken. Mangan is a fool to the members of the house party but the audience should see the tragic figure underneath.

Writing about acting and directing, Shaw said, "The beginning and end of the business from the author's point of view is the art of making the audience believe that real things are happening to real people." In this production of *Heartbreak House* there is no time for anything to happen within a character or between one character and another, except for that scene between the Captain and Ellie. Mr. Clurman has sacrificed character development for a lively pace by allowing his actors to run nimbly on stage, and just as quickly off stage before essential dramatic growth can occur. The characters are introduced picturesquely and their essential natures are clearly exposed to us but they do not interact on each other to the degree Shaw

intended. Nor is there any possibility that the house itself, which Ellie calls "this silly house, this strangely happy house, this agonizing house, this house without foundations," can affect its inhabitants. Mr. Ben Edwards has designed a romantic deck scene from a honeymooner's dream, with side walls slanting upwards and off, a gaily-striped canopy and back wall and softly-flowering vines climbing over trellises. Shaw asked for an interior for Acts I and II and a garden for Act III. Apparently he wanted no roof or canopy between his characters and their various Providences; he asked for an open space where his people would expose themselves utterly.

Fortunately, Mr. Clurman deleted only a few line sequences and the actors deliver the speeches with such contagious gusto that the audience can enjoy the full sweep of Shaw's ideas and does not suffer boredom as it did apparently in 1920 when the play had its world premiere in New York. *Heartbreak House* is a difficult play to read, and a spectacular production like the present one should arouse new interest in Shaw as a prophet. Therefore, and in spite of my criticisms, thank you, Mr. Evans and Mr. Joseph.

— Paul Kozelka<sup>1</sup>

## *The Devil's Disciple* on the Screen

*The Devil's Disciple* is the most recent of Shaw's plays to be projected upon the screen. The transition has certainly not been a successful one; in fact it is decidedly third-rate. Instead of adhering as closely as possible to Shaw's text its perpetrators have chosen to disregard it wantonly and to tack on to it a welter of their own infernal invention. From the beginning of the play until the very end they have shamefully mangled the letter and spirit of Shaw, defacing the drama almost beyond recognition.

The setting of the play is New Hampshire in the year 1777—in the midst of the Revolution. Almost at the beginning of the action occurs the first of the gratuitous scenes—the hanging of Timothy Dudgeon by the British in the village of Springtown. The British refuse to give up the body to the friends of the victim so that, hanging conspicuously in the square, it will serve as a warning to the American rebels. Dick Dudgeon, Timothy's son, regarded as the ne'er-do-well of the family, snatches the body in the middle of the night from the gibbet and carries it across his saddle to Websterbridge where the Dudgeon home is. Dick places the body in the local cemetery and awakens the Rev. Anthony Anderson, whose house is close by, so that Dick can exhibit his bravado and cynicism, with the corpse as background for the verbal bout. Shabby movie business, and not a bit of Shaw in it.

<sup>1</sup> Professor Kozelka teaches dramatics at the Teachers College of Columbia University, and has directed a production of *Heartbreak House* at Columbia.



Another scene created especially for this screen version—*per-version* is a better word—is that in which Judith Anderson, wife of the minister, rushes to the home of the dying Mrs. Dudgeon, Dick's mother, to warn her husband of his peril. She tells him that the British have arrested Dick Dudgeon, mistaking him for Anderson, and that Dick had not allowed the truth to be told, heroically saving the minister's neck and putting his own quite certainly into the noose. It is a highly hysterical and fantastic scene, and would have evoked some choice expletives from GBS. Another meaningless scene inserted for some obscure purpose is that in the forest between Websterbridge and Springtown. General Burgoyne (with a lovely lady in his carriage) and a body of British troops are moving along a difficult road towards Websterbridge. We hear the crash of great trees falling close by, the work of rebel Americans seeking to slow up the enemy's march. We hear something of Burgoyne's wit and sarcasm directed at his inefficient and unimaginative subordinates—but why cut Shaw to insert this inconsequential stuff?

The prize, however, of the creative genius of these movie makers is the sensational scene at Springtown, which consumes too many precious minutes. Anthony Anderson (played by Burt Lancaster) has escaped from Websterbridge and is seeking to join the American forces near Springtown and participate as a soldier. He manages to get into the town hall and, seeing an ammunition pile in the yard, picks up a burning log from the hearth to touch it off and destroy it. He is suddenly surprised by an English officer and they engage in a wild free-for-all, smashing each other's jaws, rolling over on the floor and under the table until at last Anderson—with one mighty blow—knocks the officer out cold. As he does, two British soldiers enter, and after another terrific struggle superman Anderson triumphs heroically. Our hero snatches another brand from the fire, hurls it out the window upon the ammunition just in time to cause a great explosion which shatters the house and demoralizes the British forces, permitting the Americans hovering nearby to come in and take the town. The authors of this exhausting spectacle were doubtless seeking to compete with our sensational "Westerns." They thoroughly achieved their cheap objective.

There are other senseless devices of this sort in the picture, including the romantic ending; but there is not space to detail them all. They completely suppress the wit and satire of GBS and hide the meaning and purpose of his play. Rarely if ever have I witnessed such merciless hacking of a worthy artistic achievement. Yet, to be entirely just, there is something to be said on the credit side. The reading-of-the-will scene remains pretty much as Shaw wrote it. Kirk Douglas as Dick Dudgeon handles his part of this scene effectively, as does the lovely Janette Scott as Judith Anderson; likewise the other actors who play the relatives of the deceased, the lawyer, etc. The same can be said of the scene in which the Andersons are taking tea with Dick as their guest. After Anderson has been called away, some British soldiers arrive to arrest the minister, who has been seditious in his sermons, but instead seize Dick, who goes willingly. The three actors play this scene excellently.

We also have the well-known court-martial, which is one of the most delightful comedic moments in modern theatre. It is ably performed by Sir Laurence Olivier as Burgoyne and Kirk Douglas as the defendant. The suave, polite general is much attracted by the courage and urbanity of Dick (whom he assumes to be Anderson); and the two get along famously as they exchange their banter, playing with life and death, all with charm and graciousness. It is finely done and for that I am grateful.

In other words, we have a splendid cast, leading actors as well as those in supporting roles. If only they had been permitted to do the play as Shaw had written it we'd have had something as good as the screen versions of *Pygmalion* and *Major Barbara*. But Shaw died in 1950, and since then most of those who have directed his plays for the screen have been extremely unintelligent, and worse. Where does the blame for this bungled *Devil's Disciple* fall? Primarily, I suppose, upon the producer, Harold Hecht, and the director, Guy Hamilton; and perhaps also upon the two who wrote the screen play, John Dighton and Roland Kibbee. But secondarily, I believe that the three stars, Olivier, Lancaster and Douglas, should assume some of the responsibility. They are in a position to choose their roles, to reject parts they do not like. They should have had the courage and the intellectual honesty to refuse to participate in a shameful distortion of a work of art by one of the world's great dramatists.

— Maxwell Steinhardt\*

---

\* Mr. Steinhardt is a Vice-President of the Shaw Society of America.

## News and Queries

Miss Helene Klein has replaced Mr. Benjamin C. Rosset as Secretary of The Shaw Society of America. Mr. Rosset has resigned in order to devote his full time to research and writing a book on Shaw now in progress. Miss Klein, formerly associate editor of *Promenade Magazine*, has recently joined the staff of *Glamour*. The new Secretary's address appears in the usual place inside back cover.

A conference of scholars — "Bernard Shaw: Aspects and Problems of Research" — was held as part of the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America in Chicago on December 28. A report on it will appear in the next issue.

Shaw on TV. "Playhouse 90" presented an adaptation of *Misalliance* in October, featuring a sumptuous set and a cast of superior players: Claire Bloom, Robert Morley, Siobhan McKenna, Kenneth Haigh, Rod Taylor, John Williams and Isobel Elson. In spite of a sparkling performance and a faithful handling of Shaw's script, the adaptation received mixed reviews from TV critics across the nation.

Shaw off-Broadway. Provincetown Playhouse curtailed its run of Shaw plays after the response to a bill of three one-acts (*Overruled; Dark Lady of the Sonnets; Passion, Poison and Petrification*) proved disappointing. Earlier plays in the repertory were *Getting Married* and *Buoyant Billions*.

Shaw on Broadway. A sumptuous revival of *Heartbreak House* opened on October 18 for a limited run. *The Shaw Review's* critic reports on it elsewhere in these pages.

Shaw around the nation. Near-famine followed the feast of summer. *Caesar and Cleopatra* was produced at Northwestern University, *The Devil's Disciple* by the Gary (Ind.) Players, both in November. Also reported was a series of concert readings from Bernard Shaw by the Manuscript Quartet at the Allens Lane Art Center, Philadelphia, in December.

Shaw in Germany. Director Gustaf Grundgens opened the 1959-60 theatre season at the *Hamburger Schauspielhaus* with *Caesar and Cleopatra*. Grundgens himself played the lead role with humor, grace, and elegance, as critic Willy Haas pointed out in *Die Welt* (Hamburg), praising also the brilliant ensemble performance of the company.

Shaw Society of America meetings. The New York Chapter, meeting at the Grolier Club, presented a production of *Annajanska, the Bolshevik Empress*, in October; a reading of *O'Flaherty V. C.* in November; and an address by Philip Burton, director of recent Shaw, Shakespeare and O'Casey productions, in December. The Shaw Society of Chicago presented a reading of *Man and Superman* in September; of Auden's *Age of Anxiety* in October; "Shaw at Random," a staged discussion of pithy excerpts from Shaw's critical essays on the performing arts, in November, and "Cameo Opera" — three original one-act operas — in December.

Three Englishmen and a Canadian woman have been selected as joint winners in the competition for the design of a new alphabet, and share the \$1400 prize offered by the Shaw Estate. The Public Trustee's representatives and the designers of the alphabets will now negotiate to devise a final form. Each alphabet has 40 to 45 letters, and otherwise meets conditions set out by Shaw in his will that each letter stand for and produce one sound unique from the others. The selection was made from 467 entries, and it is notable that the winning designs all have no special forms for capital letters. Capitals are merely larger. Punctuation remains virtually unchanged, but in all winning plans letters are much changed from forms in contemporary use.

The Public Trustee, R. P. Baulkwill, also announced that he has about \$23,240 to promote the project, including the publication of a book using the new design — probably a transliteration of *Androcles and the Lion*. Conceding that there is no way of knowing what public reaction to the new alphabet will be, he told a news conference on December 31, "We have launched a boat, but we don't know where it is going. . . . But there is a good chance we will make some money on the book. There is a lot of interest in it, especially in America." The book, if a single reformed alphabet can be agreed upon for it, is expected to be published before the end of the summer, and both distributed and offered for sale according to directions set forth by Shaw.

The alphabet reform project will be getting no more money from the Shaw Estate, although the Estate is still growing because of performance and publication royalties. Beneficiaries of the Estate (in equal shares) are The British Museum, the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art and the Irish National Gallery in Dublin.

## Queries

*The Editorial Board has suggested that the Queries section might be used fruitfully by others than authors and Ph.D. candidates — that questions often come to one's mind that deserve exploration, but are not queries preliminary to authorship of any kind. Provocative questions, once in print, according to this idea, might reach the eyes of someone who could do something about them. The Editor henceforth will accept such queries, and publish them regularly under the correspondents' initials or name if they seem of sufficient interest. Answers to such queries will also be published if they possess sufficient documentation and interest. It hardly need be said that The Shaw Review continues to welcome the usual variety of authors' queries as well, and hopes that the Review's expanding readership will render them more and more fruitful.*

I am grateful for the editor's invitation to comment on the reviews of my glossary to the plays of Shaw which appeared in *The Shaw Review*, May 1959. I will add Mr. Carpenter's list of six errors in indexing to the ten other irritating omissions and errors which

I have discovered. The publisher warned me about the dangers of numbering the items but I preferred to trust beginner's luck as a proofreader.

Professor Bosworth's criticisms of my definitions of "black-avised" and "barley-water" are, of course, justified. Such errors I can attribute only to a too literal interpretation of certain dictionary definitions. I will defend virtually all the other definitions in the glossary, however, as aids to the comprehension and interpretation of a Shaw play by a beginning student or actor. Even though some of the terms in the glossary are defined in some dictionaries, I ruefully admit that very few students, whatever their degree of motivation and zeal, will take the time to track down a definition meaningful to them and appropriate to Shaw's use of the term. The idea for a glossary came to me during a rehearsal of *Heartbreak House*, when the young lady playing Hesione asked what "pulling the devil by the tail" meant. We discussed the passage and agreed on the contextual meaning but we both needed the assurance of an authoritative definition. After a librarian had spent portions of two days searching for a definition it occurred to me that other expressions and terms in Shaw were obsolete and needed explanation for today's students. Hence, the glossary, incomplete as it is. For example, I could not include a description of Wotan Blue, of Peace and Plenty, or of the Patent Stove required in the setting for Act IV of *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. What are Johannis Churches, and did Shaw know that the Piltdown skull he mentions in *Back to Methuselah* was a fraud? Should "Minxism" be printed as "Marxism" in *Fanny's First Play*? Why did my texts say "Rosscullen" instead of "Rossccommon," and why did Shaw or Miss Patch spell Peter Lely's name as "Peter Lilly" and "Frengistani" as "Franquestani"? I discovered too late to include in the glossary the identity of the Jewish chemist referred to in *Farfetched Fables*.

With the continued cooperation of Shavian experts, I hope to make subsequent editions of the *Glossary* more accurate and comprehensive.

Paul Kozelka  
Columbia University  
New York 27, N. Y.

Some time ago I noticed in Henry L. Mencken's *George Bernard Shaw: His Plays*, published by John W. Luce and Co. in 1905, that although a section on *Major Barbara* is indicated in the table of contents, there is no such section within the text of the book itself. Examination of known Mencken collections in American libraries reveals no copy of the book with a *Major Barbara* chapter, nor any extant manuscript of the original book. Information regarding the "missing" chapter or possible additional lines of inquiry would be appreciated.

John B. Moore  
247 Amherst Avenue  
Berkeley 8, Calif.



# THE SHAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.

## OFFICERS

### President

Archibald Henderson  
721 East Franklin Street  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

### Active Vice Presidents

Richard Aldrich  
Felix Grendon  
Leonard Lyons  
Maxwell Steinhardt

### Honorary Vice-Presidents

Katharine Cornell  
Samuel Goldwyn  
Upton Sinclair  
Gene Tunney

### Secretary

Helene Klein  
28 E. 10th Street  
New York 3, N. Y.

### Treasurer

David Marshall Holtzmann  
36 West 44th Street  
New York 36, New York

### Board of Directors

Richard Aldrich  
Sara Arlen  
Warren Caro  
William D. Chase  
Alexander Clark  
Felix Grendon  
Archibald Henderson  
David Marshall Holtzmann  
Basil Langton  
Leonard Lyons  
Benj. C. Rosset  
Warren S. Smith  
Maxwell Steinhardt  
Mrs. Kenneth Taylor  
Gene Tunney

## OBJECT

To study and interpret George Bernard Shaw's writings, work, and personality; to make him more widely understood and appreciated; and to provide a meeting ground for those who admire and respect the man.

## HOW TO BECOME A MEMBER

Any person agreeing with the objectives of The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and wishing to join the Society may apply for membership. Address your application to the Treasurer. The annual fee is \$5. Checks should be made payable to The Shaw Society of America, Inc. Membership fees are tax deductible and are determined on a calendar year basis.

**RECENT BOOKS FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**Toward Gettysburg: A Biography of General John F. Reynolds**

by Edward J. Nichols

**Philosophy and Argument**

by Henry W. Johnstone, Jr.

**Mosaic and Other Poems**

by Frederic Will

**Jean Giraudoux: His Life and Works**

by Laurent LeSage

**Rehabilitation Center Planning: An Architectural Guide**

by F. Cuthbert Salmon, A.I.A., and Christine F. Salmon, A.I.A.

**The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Pennsylvania**